



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C 1134.83.95

HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY



THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDELL
CLASS OF 1882
OF NEW YORK

1918

C1134, Y5.95

Rev. Dr. Shumwood
2nd. 13
PMP

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED :

OR

DOCTOR BROWNLEE,

VERSUS

T H E B I B L E ;

VERSUS

T H E C A T H O L I C C H U R C H ;

VERSUS

T H E F A T H E R S , A N C I E N T A N D M O D E R N ;

VERSUS

H I S O W N C R E E D ;

VERSUS

H I M S E L F .

BY PHILALETHES.

"His hands against every man."

POUGHKEEPSIE :

Printed for the Author by Jackson & Schram.

1840.

~~G.1122.20~~

C1134.83.95

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
FROM
THE BEQUEST OF
EVERT JANSEN WENDELL
1918

Shawwood, Ruben.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

I am persuaded you do the Pope great good service, and he would not miss you for any thing.

ARCH BP. WHITGIFT.

There is, to every right minded man, something extremely unpleasant in feeling obliged even to think unfavorably of any one, and especially of one who claims the office, and exercises, in an extended sphere, the functions of the christian ministry. The character of a gentleman occupying a station so high and so responsible, is, by general consent, held sacred, and the world, corrupt as it may be, is inclined to respect it. For no trifling cause, therefore, should the conduct of such a man be arraigned before the bar of the public; nor for any thing short of stern necessity should his motives be called in question. And even when driven, by an abuse of misplaced confidence, to an examination and exposure of injustice and wrong done in high and holy places, and compelled to admit the existence of something more than the ordinary frailties of human nature, it is but the discharge of an obvious duty to give to such delinquencies the most favorable construction, and to attribute them to the least offensive cause.

With these sentiments we sat down to the perusal of the work now before us. We had been informed that Doctor Brownlee had delivered a course of lectures on the state of the departed, and that they were to be published. With this information we were much gratified; anticipating, as we did, from the Doctor's station and celebrity, an able, manly and christian-like exposition of this always interesting subject. But alas! we soon discovered that, in all these respects, we were doomed to be sadly disappointed. The Doctor, we are sorry to say, has fallen far below even our lowest expectations; and in this specimen of his theological erudition, power of reasoning and respect for the truth, has given, if we are not egregiously mistaken, another and decisive proof, that quackery is sometimes successful in the attainment of high stations, even in the church; as, a more striking exhibition of boasting pretension and pitiful failure, we have never seen.

Thus disappointed, yet entertaining towards the Doctor the kindest feelings, we cast around us for some adequate cause of the strange obliquity and melancholy waywardness here dis-

closed; and we could not but ask for the motives which could prompt so extraordinary a production. Some intimated to us that this was the Doctor's usual manner; that, being of a belligerent nature, his propensities were all pugnacious, and that his glory was in the field of strife and contention. Others hinted that the Doctor was ambitious of power; that he had even dreamed of the "Tiara," and that notwithstanding his many and fierce collisions with the Romanists, he was yet fond of playing the Papa, and could exercise as lordly a tyranny over a christian community, as ever the Pope did over the Church of Rome. But others, more charitably, and as we think, more correctly, suppose that the Doctor, in some of his mighty conflicts, has experienced a slight mental shock, and is a little shattered in his intellect; or, that in the violence of insatiable cravings for distinction, he has

———"eaten of the insane root
That takes the reason prisoner."

That there is something wrong about the head of this singular man—and rash, as he is singular, there can be no doubt. We had heard that, in religious matters, the Doctor was thought to be somewhat brainish; and we are now convinced that he is really laboring under some craniological malformation. We are fully persuaded that an examination by the hands of a skillful phrenologist would discover some enormous bumps, and show the organs *pravitivæ, combativæ* and *blusterativæ* to have a most extraordinary development. And to this "*Καὶ τὸς Φροῦσιν*" we are to look, it is supposed, for the cause of the many and abundant out-pourings of rabid polemicks, by which the Doctor has so frequently astounded the christian world, and rendered his name famous.

For what, short of absolute dementation, could have induced the Doctor, in the first place, to preach; then nearly a year after, to print in a Theological Review,* and again still later, to reprint in a weekly religious newspaper,† that strikingly characteristic compound of personal invective, wilful misrepresentation and crazy theology which he has dignified with the name of a Review of the Rev. Mr. Sherwood's sermon on the intermediate state? Pray, what has Mr. S. said or done? Of what upardonable offence has he been guilty, thus to excite the tremendous roarings of this Protestant Bull? We have read his sermon with some degree of attention; and although written many years ago, and with the freedom of a catechetical lecture for the benefit of the youthful members of his parish, and never designed for the public eye, it is yet, in our judgment, a fair sermon, and one, in every way, proper for the occasion on

*Princeton Review.

†Christian Intelligencer, Dec. 1839.

which it was recently preached. It sets forth, as it seems to us, in plain terms, and in an unobjectionable manner, the true doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of common sense, in relation to the state of departed souls.

But admitting the sermon to be heterodox in sentiment, and faulty in style, why should it have so disturbed the amiable Doctor's placid serenity? For what reason has he been so especially troubled with it? And for the gratification of what kind and catholic spirit, has this great man been induced thus to pour out the vials of his wrath? Yea, admitting, in all its plenitude, the Doctor's pontifical prerogative, that it is his peculiar province to take cognizance of all erroneous doctrines, and punish all offenders against orthodoxy; and further, that he has been sought on bended knee, and even in more humble acts of homage, to avenge some unfortunate suppliant for mercy, yet, could not the anathema have been pronounced in somewhat more gracious terms? Is it not enough to condemn the heresy, and burn the heretic, but must the cruel punishment be aggravated by the harsh language of a vindictive spirit? Alas, alas! how true, after all, "the little finger of presbytery is thicker than the loins of prelacy," or even papacy!

Surely, the chivalrous Doctor, verily, "a knight in the ecclesiastical way," must have been deeply impressed with the responsibility of his high place in the church militant, must have burned with intense desire for some exploit, must, indeed, have been absolutely longing for adventure, when he made so furious a tilt upon the harmless doctrine of this sermon. But where there exist strong natural aberrations of intellect, confirmed by a chronic affection of the brain, things are always seen through a distorted medium. The valorous Doctor doubtless thought the sermon an object worthy of his mighty prowess; and he felt himself called upon to redress this theological grievance, and chastise with appropriate gallantry and grace the temerity of its author. It is possible too, that, in this adventure, the renowned knight may have been moved, in some degree, by his benevolent sympathies for his unfortunate Squire, who, in the honorable anxiety to save himself, by seeking, with instinctive sagacity, the shelter of some redoubtable name, personal or corporate, it matters not, may have been tempted to "play false" with his master. Should there be truth in this suggestion, that worthy gentleman has done wrong, has indeed been ungrateful; and his conscience, we are sure, must drive him on to the stool of repentance. And we are willing to think that, when he sees the sad predicament into which he has helped to lead his valiant and generous protector, he will hasten to *disabuse* his noble mind of the pious fraud he has practiced upon it.

'But to the Doctor's *contras*:—and here, it must not be supposed for a moment, that we intend a discussion with the Doctor on the subject of an intermediate state. This is very far from our intention, and for reasons which, before we are through, will be sufficiently manifest. Why should it be attempted? Mr. S. has placed the doctrine of his sermon on the sure and impregnable basis of reason, revelation and the authority of the Church; nor has the Doctor, in the whole of his labored review, adduced any thing to shake, in the slightest degree, one of his positions. He has indeed given us an abundance of hard names, bold assertion and reckless denunciation; but any thing like fair, dispassionate and manly argument, we have not been able to discover.

We have said that the Doctor is against himself. We begin with this *contra*, from personal respect to the Doctor, and for personal convenience to ourselves. For, it being seen that the Doctor's hands are against himself, there will be less difficulty in showing, as well as less surprise in finding them against others.

In looking over the Doctor's twelve or fifteen large newspaper column review,* a sufficiently respectable article in length, improved and perfected by all the advantages of as many months of consideration, correction and republication, we noticed, as we thought, some rather low personalities—some little want of good temper, kind feeling and gentlemanly courtesy—some slight indications of vanity—and something like cant, sneering and bitterness:—thus,—“*Our Rector*”—“*though not a Goliath to encounter*”—“*hastening to teach others before he has himself studied the topic of discussion*”—“*the puerile and unanswerable logic of the Rev. Rector of St. James*”—“*inexcusable ignorance of church history*”—“*meagre gleanings.*”† These, with a suitable number of *et ceteras*, and a dazling display of the “*punctum admirationis*,” are a few specimens of the dignified manner, graceful diction, and elegant witticisms, by which the learned and accomplished Doctor would forestall the judgment of his hearers and readers, stifle the voice of truth, and excite odium against an unoffending christian brother. But as we cannot suppose that even the Doctor thought that these rude personalities could take the place of argument, or in any way serve the cause of truth, we conclude that he intended them merely as ornaments—sparkling little gems, to adorn this super-elegant and double-refined Review. We shall therefore take no further notice of them than to set them down as so much against the Doctor's *self*, as a courteous and gentlemanly reviewer.

*The Christian Intelligencer edition, the only one that we have seen.

†These, with many other expressions of a like nature, grace the Doctor's first No. in the Intelligencer.

The Doctor commences his review by assuming and declaring, and this too, in the face of facts to the contrary, that Mr. S. was the aggressor—was indeed a “challenger.” Now happening to know something of the origin of this sermon, and of the circumstances under which it was preached and published, we affirm, and without the fear of contradiction, that the Doctor’s assumption and declaration have not even the semblance of truth for their support. So far was Mr. S. from being the aggressor, it is notorious that he was himself assailed, wantonly, violently and publicly assailed. It is indeed possible that the Doctor may have been deceived in this matter; but then, if so, we must say, willingly, as he held in his hands the proof that what he had assumed and declared was not true.

In his further efforts to make Mr. S. the aggressor, the Doctor asserts—shall we say “with inexcusable ignorance?” O, no;—could we bring ourselves to retort upon the Doctor his own courteous language, it would not meet the point, but with incredible infatuation; and, as if to make the strange fatuity more apparent, he repeats the assertion, that “Mr. S. has charged upon us,” the R. D. Church, it is supposed, “an ancient heresy.” This heresy, the Doctor says, in direct and unqualified terms, “Mr. S. through inexcusable ignorance of church history, has actually charged upon us as our doctrine.” Nor is Mr. S. the only one who falls under this terrible denunciation of charging, thro’ inexcusable ignorance of church history, this ancient heresy upon their neighbors. For, says the Doctor again, “they,” the high church party, “charge upon us the guilt of adhering to an ancient heresy.” O, ye Pearsons and Bulls, ye Burnets and Seckers, ye Horns and Horsleys, ye Seaburys and Hobarts, yea, ye Calvins and Campbells, and ye Wesleys and Clarks, come bow your diminutive heads to this mighty censor, this self constituted Oracle of the Collegiate R. D. Church, and confess before him your ignorance and folly! But what was that ancient heresy, at the very thought of which the Doctor is so filled with horror?—All that Mr. S. says on this subject is in these words,

“There was an ancient heresy which set forth the doctrine that the souls of the faithful go at death immediately into heaven, and enter on the full fruition of their God. And it must be admitted that, with some variety of form, this doctrine has had its friends and supporters in different ages of the Church: nor yet can it be denied, that it has its advocates even at the present day. It is but justice however, to remark, that between the ancient and the modern exhibitions of this doctrine, there is sometimes found this difference,—that, in the former, the doctrine is, for the most part, connected with a denial of the resurrection of the dead, and consequently of the general judgment; whereas in the latter, these great christian verities are generally admitted, although it may be somewhat difficult to see in what consists the value of the admission, or to understand the nature of the resurrection, and the reason of the general judgment.”

But does Doct. B. admit that the doctrine of sending saints to heaven, at death, is a heresy? Is not this the very doctrine which throughout the whole of his laboured review, Dr. B. is endeavoring to establish? And does he not again and again declare this to be the true doctrine? Listen to some few of "his profound conclusions." Having wrested certain portions of scripture from their true and obvious meaning he says,*

"Hence departed souls are now with him [Christ] in heaven."—"Therefore departed souls of believers do go into heaven and its eternal glory."—"Therefore the souls of departed christians are with Christ in the glory and happiness of heaven."—"The departed are of course *in heaven*, as certainly as those who are *not* departed are upon earth. There is of course no middle place. It is unknown on the pages of the Holy Bible. They are all either in heaven, or on earth. Hence every member of Christ's family, when they leave the church below, are [is] received into the family of God above, in the heaven of heavens."

Verily, if the doctrine of sending souls, at death, immediately to heaven, be heresy, "nothing has ever yet existed so precisely like" heresy, dear Doctor, as this your review. But heresy or not, where is the evidence of the truth of the Doctor's unqualified, deliberate and repeated assertion that "Mr. S. has charged this heresy upon us," Dr. B., the R. D. Church, or any other individual or body? Not a particle exists. But will Dr. B. deliberately and repeatedly, preach, print, and reprint such a direct and unqualified assertion without proof? Has he not referred to the very page of Mr. S.'s sermon for the evidence by which this assertion may be sustained? The Doctor has indeed made such a reference; and sorry we are, *on his account*, that he has done so. We have given above, every word that Mr. S. has said respecting that ancient heresy. And we wish that all who can lay hands on that sermon, would turn to page the 7th, to which the Doctor has twice referred, and read for themselves. It will be found that the Doctor predicated, and largely too, on something besides, "inexcusable ignorance," when he ventured on such a reference for the support of this utterly unfounded and cruel assertion. He very well knew, that not one of ten thousand, who had heard, and would read the various spoken, written, and printed versions of this wicked calumny, would ever see the sermon of Mr. S. to which this falsehood appeals for its support; or if seeing it, would ever take the trouble to examine it. We however have examined carefully the page referred to, and we defy the power of genius to draw from that page, or any other part of the sermon, the slightest warrant or justification for the Doctor's broad, unqualified and repeated assertion. And as for the appendix written for the express purpose of further elucidating the doctrine of the sermon, and defending its author against the "gross attack," made upon him, Mr. S. is so

*See Chris. Intel., Dec. 21, 1839, No. III.

far from charging the R. D. Church with this "ancient heresy," that he labors, and we think, with complete success, to show that the doctrine of that church, on the subject in question, is in perfect harmony with his own. We therefore set down this wilful, deliberate and cruel misrepresentation as so much—more by and by, against the Doctor's *self* as a candid, honorable, and trusty reviewer.

Another of the Doctor's troubles with Mr. S.'s sermon, is its want of taste. His exquisitely refined sensibilities are here absolutely shocked. And although he has not given us a single sentence of the sermon—yet, we have his word for it, that "no man of taste can endure the vulgarity of his style." Now as this is a quality of writing, in which the Doctor has had great experience, and as he is pre-eminently distinguished as a practical judge, his naked assertion, always so true and just, must be deemed entirely satisfactory. Admitting, therefore, the old adage, "*De gustibus non disputandum est*," we yield this point without debate. That Doctor B. is a man of taste, we have the most abundant, as well as convincing evidence, if not in some of his immortal works heretofore given to the public, certainly in the marvellous exhibition of intellectual refinement now before us. We therefore set down this amiable effervescence of offended delicacy, merely as the result of some slight, perhaps accidental irritation of the Doctor's nervous system, wherein the sensitive man happened to get the mastery over the rational; and his sufferings—here, often in this naughty world, the penalty of superior genius, we cannot but commiserate.

But the want of taste is not the only or chief sin of Mr. S.

"He has yet to study the theology of the best fathers of his own Church; and in a special manner the subject which he has undertaken to discuss. He hastens to teach others before he has himself studied the topic of discussion. He hurries into his subject without definitions or explanations. Hence he sails the whole of his voyage under false colours."*

Now the only emotion excited by this strikingly modest and tasteful exhibition of truth, justice, and loving kindness, was that of wonder, that the Doctor should have given so much time and labor to such an imperfect, unstudied and harmless production; for surely so great and good a man might, it would seem, have found other and more profitable employment.

Whether "Mr. S. has studied the best fathers in his own church on the topic of discussion," we know not; but this we know; he has contrived to extract from those fathers such a mass of evidence, in support of his opinions, as no unprejudiced mind can resist; and from it, to forge a chain of testimony so strong, that the Doctor, with all his hard blows, has not been able to make the slightest impression upon a single link of it. Then

*See Chris. Intel., Dec. 7, 1839, No. I.

as to definitions, explanations and such like matters, if Mr. S. has ventured to preach a sermon without defining clearly, and explaining fully, every thing in relation to it, he is certainly much to blame, and merits the severest chastisement for such neglect, as no one, save and excepting always Doct. B., should be allowed to practice such liberties. But were not the Doctor the most veritable, as well as the most gentlemanly and honorable of critics, we should suspect that he had not even read the sermon which he has so skilfully reviewed; but taking for granted, it was a heretical production, or to carry out his own figure—some small piratical craft, “sailing under false colours,” and offering a fit opportunity for the display of his tremendous battering powers, he immediately bore down and gave battle accordingly. As evidence, however, of the entire confidence that may be placed in the Doctor’s complaints, as well as in the accuracy of his facts, it may not be amiss to state, that the first three pages of Mr. S.’s sermon are almost entirely occupied in defining and explaining the meaning and use of the word *Paradise*, on which, it will be remembered, the whole question of an intermediate state turns. In the Appendix, seven pages more are given to the further explanation of this same word *Paradise*; and eight more are exclusively devoted to the meaning and use of the words *Hades* and *Hell*. Now eighteen pages out of sixty, seems a pretty liberal allowance for the definition and explanation of two or three words.

Hardly does the Doctor recover from the shock occasioned by the bad taste and other enormities of Mr. S. when, unfortunate man, he is thrown into a state of perfect phrensy by the “theory” of Mr. S., “and the unique and matchless logic, more mysterious than Geneva logic,” by which he sustains it. Now were not the Doctor so very clever, even in his delirium, we should be tempted to break a lance with him here on the score of cruel consistency. He raises the hope of conferring on Mr. S. the honor of being the author of a “theory.” He again and again calls it “his theory;” but alas, cruel hope, and more cruel Doctor, how suddenly do the brightest visions of glory sometimes vanish! Mr. S. is soon stripped of all the merit of originality; and that, which was but just now “his theory,” becomes with most admirable consistency, in the course of three or four sentences, “the meagre gleanings from the pages of bishops Seabury and Hobart:” and as if this were not enough, after a few sentences more, this theory of Mr. S. becomes “the theory of the whole high church party in England and in this country.” And it finally turns out that both the “theory and the puerile and unanswerable logic” of Mr. S. are but the theory and logic of “the whole high church party”—yea, the theory and logic of the whole Catholic Church. We strongly suspect,

however, that the Doctor has, after all, done no more than justice to Mr. S. in taking from him all "the merit of originality" respecting this theory. Being, as we understand, a thorough going old fashioned churchman, Mr. S. would not, we fancy, deem it very flattering to be thought the author of any novelty in relation to the old, unalterable and unimproveable character of true religion. Nor do we believe that he will consider it any ill compliment to be thought a disciple of such masters as Seabury and Hobart, and a host of others in the ranks of high churchmen. The only thing, therefore, we object to in all this, is the incorrectness of the Doctor's phraseology; in calling high churchmen a party in the Church, and representing this party as a "*Sect.*" The Doctor should have known that the Church is no party; and further, that "*sect*" means something, not in the Church, but cut off from the Church. These, however, are but slight mistakes, and which, in the future editions of this immortal work, we trust, will be corrected.

But the "Πρωτον Ψευδος" of this theory of Mr. S. as the Doctor, with his usual taste and good nature, calls it; or the principal and leading falsehood "of his theory"—the theory of Seabury and Hobart—"the theory of the high church party"—"the theory of the Catholic Church," "is this:—There is a general judgment at the last day, when the saints are perfect in holiness and happiness. . . . Hence he draws the profound inferences, that, *therefore*, there is no particular judgment at their death; *therefore*, the believer does not depart *in holiness* at death; and, *therefore*, not one soul enters heaven until the final day of judgment; because they are all made perfect in holiness and perfect in happiness only at the last day? This single assumption is pressed in to sustain his whole theory."*

Now what the Doctor here pronounces a "principal or leading falsehood," and an "assumption," terms, the meaning and use of which no one better understands, we should call a clearly revealed and well established truth. It is neither more nor less than this; that, as there will be, in the end of the world, and after the general resurrection, a day of general judgment, when God will render to every man according to his deeds, none will enter heaven, the place of perfect bliss, or hell, the place of complete misery, till after that great and fearful event. And as a necessary consequence of this truth, the theory of Mr. S.—of the high church party—of the Catholic church, supposes that the souls of men, from death to the resurrection, while their bodies, are mouldering in the dust, and when man, as such, does not exist, are in Hades, the invisible place, the place of departed spirits; the righteous in one region of it, called Paradise, and Abraham's bosom, where they are in "joy and felicity;" and the wicked in another region of it, such as was that occupied by Dives, and where they are in suffering and torment. "In this invisible

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839. No. I.

place, says Mr. S.* the souls of all who have died, or will die, remain, the righteous in a state of rest and happiness, though not perfect, and the wicked, in a state of misery, though not complete, till their reunion with their bodies, and the consummation of their bliss, or their wo, at the general resurrection and judgment of the last day." But this, it seems is too tardy a process for the ardent temperament of Doctor Brownlee. He cannot wait for the natural and religious order of events, but burns for instant fulness of enjoyment. He is therefore determined to thrust all souls immediately into heaven or hell, the moment they leave the body. Now, we do read of the kingdom of heaven suffering violence, and of the violent taking it by force, though not perhaps exactly in the Doctor's way, but we had not anticipated such violence being done to the other place. The Doctor does indeed contend vehemently for an intermediate state; and but for his very great haste, in making one part of man perfectly happy, or perfectly miserable, while separated from the other part, we see not but that he might soon become, on this point, strictly orthodox. At present, however, he insists upon it, "that an intermediate state is no intermediate place;" and he belabours Mr. S. and "the whole high church party" most soundly, for their blindness in not seeing, or their sophistry in confounding this important and obvious distinction. He says,†

"They involve themselves in ambiguity and confusion at every step." Again, "This error pervades their every argument. They lose sight some how or other, of our doctrine entirely." And again, "Having thus put themselves in a wrong position, they have fallen and floundered into an argument befitting this false position."

To this strikingly modest and amiable exhibition of the theory and logic of the high church party, we have only to say, that, as there are few, if any, who can lay claim to the profoundly penetrating and accurately discriminating mind of the Doctor, we regret that, in the magnanimity of his soul, he did not exercise a little more tenderness and compassion towards his inferior and less gifted fellow mortals, even though they were unable to understand, or keep in sight his doctrine. But we must leave Mr. S. and the high church party to the consequences of their "false position," and hasten to make our escape, lest we share their fate. We therefore respectfully beg the learned Doctor to excuse us from entering with him this deep, dark well of metaphysical subtilty, lest we never get out again. For, supposing, with Bishop Horsley, "existence without place to be one of the incommunicable attributes of the Divine Being," we are absolutely afraid that, in the amazing length and breadth,

*Ser In. State. p. 16.

†See Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839. No. I.

height and depth of the Doctor's learning, we shall, in such a discussion, find ourselves in a worse predicament than even high churchmen. When therefore the Doctor begins to talk of state without place, we feel that it is time to pass on, lest we lose sight not only of him and his doctrine, but also of ourselves. We therefore set down all this inconsistency, misrepresentation, falsity, railing, violence and dogmatism, as so much against the Doctor's *self*, as an honest, skilful and competent reviewer.

But if the Doctor can get souls immediately into heaven in no other way, he is determined to send them there by analogy. He has an illustration of this nature, with which he seems very much pleased; and as it is the most like an argument of any thing we find in his whole review, it may be worth a passing notice. Affirming as he does, "a particular judgment or decision" upon each individual at death—alluding to "the false position" of the high church party, in referring all judgment to the great and last day, the day of general judgment—and railing at the arguments into which "they have fallen and floundered so befitting their false position," the Doctor says,

"By this mode of reasoning, they might with equal success prove that because there is a general Providence there can be no particular providence! And because the son and heir of a kingdom does not reach the full honors, and the complete enjoyment of his estate, until he is fully of age; therefore he is not admitted to his father's table, nor even allowed to appear in his father's house, during the intermediate state of his non age!"*

Now of all the logical fallacies, so frequently found in this logical world, that of analogical argumentation is the most fallacious. Of this truth the Doctor has here given us a striking illustration. Of the first of the preceding sentences respecting "Providence," we have only to say, that were the argument intended, much less like a "*petitio principii*" than it really is, yet as it squints so awfully towards the region of the Doctor's peculiar metaphysical theology, we are afraid to meddle with it, lest, like the high churchmen, we be accused of "losing sight altogether of his doctrine." In the second sentence the Doctor has given us a very pretty illustration, and it would be entirely satisfactory, but for one trifling defect—it is, in the Doctor's own words, "nothing to the purpose." By the "son and heir of a kingdom," we suppose the Doctor means the king's son, who is the heir apparent. This son and heir, possessing the whole and entire nature of his father and sovereign, may undoubtedly 'be admitted into his father's house,' to sit at his father's table, and, to a certain extent, participate in the honors and blessings of his father's kingdom;—but then, we suppose also, that this son and heir must, at least during "his intermediate

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839. No. I.

state of non age," be under tutors and governors, must occupy different apartments; and hold a subordinate place in the kingdom. And if so, with regard to the son and heir, how much more so, with regard to the common and ordinary subjects of the Realm, and who, as in the case now before us, possess, during the intermediate state of their non age—that is, from death to resurrection, but one half of the nature of their Father and Sovereign. Now for the application of the Doctor's analogical argument;—Christ, the Saviour, is the King; the Church is his kingdom; and Christians are the children and heirs of this kingdom. This kingdom of Christ, we suppose the Doctor will admit, extends to this world, and embraces all the saints on earth. He will also admit, that in this kingdom, we are, even here on earth, allowed to sit at the King's table, and, to a certain extent, participate in the blessings of the kingdom. And we suppose further, though of this we dare not be positive, that the Doctor will admit that earth is not heaven, and that saints, living on earth, though sons and heirs of the kingdom, are not in heaven. The great objection, therefore, to the Doctor's analogical argument, is, that it seems to cast out the son and heir of the kingdom the moment he dies. Abating this objection, and admitting that christians, while on earth, are in the kingdom, that they are not thrust out at death, and the Doctor's analogy may be good so far as it goes. But what has all this to do with heaven, on which it was intended to bear? Nothing at all: it does not reach the point at which the Doctor is aiming. And his error—we will not sayh is *Πρωτον Ψευδος* consists in confounding heaven, or the kingdom of heaven, the eternal kingdom of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, the place of the future residence of the entire and perfect man, in perfect holiness and perfect bliss, with the mediatorial kingdom of Christ, the residence of sinful, probationary man till death, and of the soul, the one half of man, till the resurrection. This mediatorial kingdom of Christ, or the kingdom of Christ, as God-man, embracing all the faithful here on earth, and the souls of the righteous, while in their separate state, or till their reunion with their bodies, at the resurrection in the last day, is not heaven, nor in heaven, in the highest and usual sense of this word. Neither is this kingdom eternal;—it had a beginning, and will have an end. In this kingdom Christ will indeed reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet: and the last enemy to be destroyed, we know, is death. When therefore the objects for which this kingdom was established, shall be accomplished; and Christ, our Medatorial King, shall have performed those two last great acts of royalty, the raising the dead, and judging the world, He will then deliver up the kingdom to God, and as man be subject to him, who as

God, put all things under him, that God—God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, may be all in all.

But the doctor complains, that, "by way of argumentum ad invidiam"—(he should have said *argumentum ad verecundiam*) "our opponents charge it to the guilt of our doctrine, that is primarily popish. Mr. S. following in the steps of his masters" (a very safe course) "ventures to tell the public that the Church of Rome was the first to declare authoritatively that the souls of the believers enter immediately into glory. It will be enough, in order to set him right, simply to quote the Romish doctrine, as established by the council of Florence, 'Tria esse loca, &c.' There are three places of departed souls; those of the saints are in heaven, those of the wicked are in hell, those who died under *venial* sins are in purgatory."*

Now we humbly submit, whether it would have been more than 'fair, on the part of the Doctor, to have proved Mr. S. wrong, before he attempted to "set him right." And as Mr. S. had cited this very council of Florence in support of his assertion, that the church of Rome was the first to declare authoritatively that saints go immediately to heaven, we must confess our entire inability to discover the ground of the Doctor's complaint, or his object in quoting this council. We suppose however, he wanted a quotation, or at least a reference, and whether for or against him, it mattered not, so that it was not examined. For so surely as the Doctor has quoted this passage correctly, so surely it establishes the entire truth of what "Mr. S. ventured to tell the public," and proves—"not sets right," but proves that he was "right." "There are three places of departed souls :"—"*Those of the righteous are in heaven.*" The doctrine of the Church of Rome then, is, that saints are in heaven. The same, according to Dr. B. is his doctrine. Verily, dear Doctor, if on this point, you are not a Papist "no one has ever yet existed so precisely like one." "There is scarcely even a degree of visibility" between your doctrine and that of the Church of Rome. Dr. B. then and the Church of Rome are one in their doctrine of departed saints. They both say that departed saints are in heaven: and the only questions between them, are those of priority in the discovery of the doctrine, and the honor of having first authoritatively declared it. If the Doctor can show—a difficult matter, we think, that any church ever declared that saints passed at death immediately into heaven, before the Church of Rome, at the council Florence; or, if he can show—a still more difficult matter we trow, that he or his Church existed previous to that Council, he may bear off the palm. But if he cannot show this, then he must bow, and from his peculiar love and affection for her, we doubt not, he will bow with grace, to the superior claims of the Church of Rome, and cheerfully admit that, in this particular, he is her faithful follower.

We have expressed ourselves at loss to discover the Doctor's

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839—No 1.

object in citing this scrap from the Council of Florence, or to see how it either proved Mr. S. wrong, or set him right. But looking on a little further, the whole matter is explained. The key to unlock this marvel, will be found in these terrible words, "Those who die under *venial* sins are in purgatory." For it must be remembered that however closely united are the Doctor and the Church of Rome on the main point, there is yet this small difference between them. The Doctor divides mankind at death into two classes, the righteous and the wicked; the former he sends direct to heaven, the latter, straight to hell; whereas the Church of Rome divides them into three classes, sending the eminently righteous to heaven, the incorrigibly wicked to hell, and leaving a third class, who die under *venial* sins, which she sends to another place called purgatory. Now which of the two theories is nearest the truth, we shall not attempt to decide; it being a matter in which we are not particularly interested, we leave it to be settled by the infallibility of their respective holinesses, the Doctor and the Pope. The very sight however of the word "purgatory," and especially, the being obliged to speak it, and write it, were sufficient to curdle the Doctor's brains; and the odious idea once in his head, there is room for nothing else, it takes entire possession of all his faculties and affects all his senses. He sees its vile abominations painted on every object, and snuffs its offensive odor in every breeze. He can see no distinction between the Catholic doctrine of an intermediate place, and the dogma of a Roman purgatory. He can understand nothing of the different degrees of perfection in man, as existing in his present state, his intermediate state, and his glorified state; nor yet can he find any happiness for the souls of the righteous, short of the highest heavens. He therefore resolves to make all who maintain the Catholic doctrine of an intermediate state, say what they will to the contrary, thorough-going, rank purgatorians. He says,*

"The only difference between our high churchmen, and the Oxford divines, and the Dublin Doctor Todd, is simply this,—the latter have got considerably the start of the former. They have been both on the same descent; and are both in full career of descent to find their level. Hence there is scarcely even a degree of visibility between the high church doctrine and the more ancient fiction of purgatory."

Now we cannot but think that the Doctor is here again a little inconsistent in placing Mr. S. at all in the rear of any in this "descending course," having just said in a note—"Thus, our Rector actually avows his faith in the Popish Limbus of the Fathers." As we have here the Doctor's direct and unqualified assertion for this "avowal" of Mr. S. with the pages of his sermon referred to as proof, those, not acquainted with the Doc-

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839. No. I.

tor's mode of quoting writers, or his object in giving references, would naturally expect to find on those pages the evidence of the truth of this assertion. We can assure our readers, however, that neither on those pages, nor in any part of Mr. S.'s little work, is there a syllable that can be tortured into even a shadow of justification for this wilful and deliberate untruth. But let Mr. S. speak for himself in this matter. In the appendix to his sermon, pp. 55 and 6, he says,

"One of the charges brought against the author of the sermon, is that old, hackneyed, and clumsy one of 'rank Popery,' and intended, as is supposed, to convey the idea, that, because he maintains the *true* doctrine of an intermediate state, he must, of course, hold the *erroneous* one of purgatory; as if an intermediate state, and purgatory were one and the same thing! But what is the object of this cry of Popery? And why is it so frequently raised against the Church? The writer has often asked himself these questions, yet has never been able to find a satisfactory answer. Does the cause of truth demand it? Surely not, for this holy principle is always injured and grieved by such 'gross and uncharitable imputations.' Can it be done merely for effect? This he is unwilling to believe, as such a purpose is altogether unworthy of generous and noble minds. Besides, such a purpose must necessarily defeat itself; and the writer is very much mistaken in the intelligence of the present generation, if this stale charge—and disingenuous as it is stale—be not altogether too late in the day, to gain the least credit with those who think at all for themselves, or to bring much of reputation, for either sagacity or prudence, to those who venture to make it. We have already seen that there is necessarily no connection between the doctrine of an intermediate state and that of a Roman purgatory—have seen, indeed, that one is directly the opposite of the other. We know that our probation ceases with death; and that having once entered either of the mansions of *Hades*, the invisible place of departed souls, there can be no change in our situation from one of these mansions to the other. Our Lord hath put this matter at rest, by the parable of Lazarus and the rich man; these were both in *Hades*, yet in very different regions of it, and forever separated by an *impassable gulf*. There is not, therefore, a semblance of plausibility for attempting to fix upon an intermediate state the character of a purgatory. Besides, they who contend that the souls of the righteous go, at death, immediately to heaven, ought to be aware that, in this doctrine, they are in close alliance with that very Church which they affect so cordially to reprobate. They should know that the Church of Rome was the first to declare authoritatively the doctrine that the souls of the righteous pass, at death, immediately into glory. And they should know further, that this doctrine was established by that Church, for the unquestionable purpose of laying a foundation for the subsequent establishment of the doctrine of invocation to saints. The Church of Rome, well aware of the utter impossibility of bringing the Christian world to believe that prayers to departed saints could be of any avail, so long as these saints were supposed to be in an intermediate and imperfect state, laboured long and strenuously to establish the doctrine, that saints pass, at death, immediately to heaven; supposing that having them there seated in glory, around the throne of God, they might the more easily be made the objects of adoration and worship. It was not, however, till the fifteenth century, that the Church of Rome succeeded in carrying her favorite doctrine in relation to the state of departed saints. At the council of Florence, held in 1439, and when a union was formed between the Greek and Roman Churches, the doctrine, that the souls of the righteous go, at death, into the full fruition of God, was for the first time established. The language of the decree of this council, in relation to this matter, is, 'The souls of those who have never sinned since their bap-

tism, or of those who having fallen into sins, have been purified from them in their bodies, or after their departure out of them, enter immediately into Heaven, and see purely the Trinity.*

Verily, the charge of Popery comes with an ill grace from those who maintain that Paradise is heaven, that the souls of the righteous pass, at death, immediately into glory, and who are themselves thus closely leagued with the Romish Church, in support of her most erroneous and dangerous doctrines."

Yet, with all this, and much more, in full view before him, Doct. B. could again and again charge Mr. S. with maintaining a purgatory, could cite the council of Florence, against the fact, that the Church of Rome was the first to declare authoritatively the doctrine that saints go immediately to heaven, and finally, to crown his wilful misrepresentation, and cruel injustice, with deliberate untruth, could declare that Mr. S. "had actually avowed his faith in the Popish Limbus of the Fathers!" Oh shame, where is thy blush!

But as these *self-contras* pervade the whole of the Doctor's review, and become more and more prominent, and put on a more and more fearful character as we proceed, we will pass on to his Creed.

NOTE.—Since writing the above, a friend has put into our hands the Chris. Intel. of May 9th, 1840, containing a "Reply to the Rev. Dr. Brownlee," from the pen, it is said, of a Rev. Prof. in the Theological Seminary of the R. D. C. in N. Brunswick. From this we may learn something of the estimation, in which the Doctor is held by his own brethren. As the author seems to have a good knowledge of the Doctor's character, we give the following miniature picture, which is supposed to be an admirable likeness.

"All acquainted with his habits of thought and the '*curiosa felicitas*' of his style, must have recognized the *foot of Hercules* before completing the second paragraph. It is personal, and bitter, of course. The Doctor is an admirable specimen of a numerous class in the present day, who cannot estimate the force of the plainest argument on the plainest subject, until they call up a lively conception of the man, woman, or child, who uses it—who never look at truth, or falsehood, in the abstract, but only as impersonated in some individual whom they make their idol or their victim as the caprice of the hour inclines. Deprive them in debate of a visible and tangible adversary against whom they may raise the war-whoop and brandish the scalping-knife, they become tame and insipid at once. I do not believe that there is a page of my friend's polemical writings which is not sullied with this vice, nor that he has ever had an opponent, who did not retire from the field discomfited far more by the virulence of his abuse than the potency of his logic."

*DuPin. Eccle. His. Vol. IV, p. 45, Lon. Ed.

Doctor Brownlee vs. His own Creed.

Under this head we shall make but a single specification. This, however, will embrace the main point, and chief source of all the Doctor's difficulties in this matter—his hair splitting quibble about state and place, or his attempt to make a distinction where there is no difference. The Doctor contends stoutly for an intermediate state, but then, as stoutly denies an intermediate place:—a distinction, unknown to the best theological writers, unintelligible to common sense, and unexisting but in the dark mysteries of metaphysical subtilty. That, in denying an intermediate place, the Doctor is against his own creed, might be made to appear—indeed has been made to appear, by an appeal to the Liturgy, Psalms and Hymns, and especially, to the Confession of Faith of the R. D. Church. Mr. S. in the Appendix to his sermon, has clearly proved that, by a fair and reasonable construction of those Standards, they are decidedly against the Popish doctrine of sending souls, at death, immediately to heaven. We will, however, pass all these by, and confine ourselves to a single phrase, in one of the articles of the Apostle's Creed—"He descended into Hell." This Creed, as a minister of the R. D. Church, the Doctor is supposed to acknowledge; and, if he be not an Apollinarian, we suppose he will admit, that the language—He descended into Hell, is predicated of the human soul of Christ. From the place and connection these words hold in the Creed, it would seem there could be no doubt that they refer to the action of the soul of Christ, during the interval, between his death and resurrection, and while his body lay in the tomb. And this being true, they certainly affirm a real local motion of the soul of Christ;—and what is more, a motion, so far as language has any meaning, directly the opposite of that which took place after his resurrection. And if real local motion be denied to the words—"He descended into Hell," we see not but it must be denied also to those—"He ascended into Heaven." The Creed then, affirms that the soul of Christ, between his death and resurrection, really and truly descended into Hell.

"It is evident," says Bishop Horsley, "that the descending into hell, is spoken of as an action of the Lord, but as an action performed by him after he was dead and buried, and before he rose again. . . . This, therefore, was an act of that part of the man which continues alive after death, that is, of the soul separated by death from the body, as the interment must be understood of the body apart from the soul. The dead body could no more go into hell than the living soul could be laid in the grave. Considering the words, therefore, as they stand in the Creed, as the Church now receives it, they seem as little capable of any variety of meaning, and almost as little to require explanation, as the word buried."

The soul of Christ, then, according to the Creed, actually descended into hell. And supposing that the Doctor will admit hell to be a place, we see not but he will be compelled to admit also, that the soul of Christ, during its separation from the body, was not only in a state, but a *place*—was indeed in hell. Now the word hell, as used in the Creed, must mean Gehenna, the place of final and complete torment, or heaven, the place of final and perfect bliss, or some other place. That the word hell, as here used, means the place of torment, even the Doctor does not believe; for he says distinctly Christ never went there. And we take it for granted, that he will not contend that hell, in the Creed, means heaven; for, besides the wickedness of imputing such absurdity and nonsense to this universally acknowledged symbol of faith, it would, as has been aptly suggested, sound a little odd, to say hell was heaven, and heaven was hell; or in repeating the creed, to say—He was dead and buried, he descended into heaven; and the third day, he rose again, and ascended into hell. If, then, the word hell, as used in the Creed, does not mean hell, the place of torment, nor yet heaven, the place of happiness, it must, Doctor Brownlee to the contrary notwithstanding, mean some other place. And pray, what place can that be, but that happy and blessed region of Hades, called Paradise, even “the glorious country of the soul,” where Christ went, in company with the penitent thief, on the day he was crucified; where the souls of all the faithful go, and where, during their separation from their bodies, they are in ‘joy and felicity,’ waiting, in sure and certain hope, the consummation of their bliss, at the great and last day.” Doctor Brownlee, then, receiving the Apostle’s Creed, yet denying an intermediate place, must stand convicted of opposition to his own Creed. But it is not in relation to an intermediate place only, that the Doctor is against his own Creed. He denies that Christ went to hell at all. In his “Revised and corrected specimens of Divine Truths,”* and in answer to the question in the Creed—“Did he (Christ) not then descend into hell itself?” Answer—“Not at all; for while he was dead, his body was in the grave, and his soul in heaven.” It is, therefore, doing no injustice to the Doctor, to set him down, as against his own Creed, and the acknowledged Creed of the Church of which he is a minister. It may not be amiss to remark here, that, as these “Revised and corrected specimens of Divine Truths,” bear not the impress of authority, there is no evidence that they have the sanction of the R. D. Church. Perhaps the Doctor has revised and corrected a little too much to be in harmony with the standards of that Church. From a slight comparison, we should think this not an improbable fact.

*Phil. Ed. 1837, p. 45.

Doctor Brownlee vs. the Fathers, Ancient and Modern.

And first, of the Modern. As "Mr. S. has yet to study the theology of the best fathers of his own Church, and in a special manner, the subject he has undertaken to discuss," he will, we are sure, be greatly obliged to Doctor B. for thus kindly pointing out to him those "best fathers," of whose worth, and even existence, he is so obviously ignorant; nor can we doubt but that he will profit by the hint thus given him. We must be allowed to express our gratification also, not only at finding the Doctor's judgment of these "best fathers," so entirely in harmony with our own, but also, and more especially, at discovering how much respect and good will he entertains for those "leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way." Nor is this all:—having the Doctor's high approbation of the sentiments of those "best fathers," we feel that an important point is gained, and that our labours, under this head, are very much lessened. We only regret that, while his hand was in, the Doctor did not, out of his great knowledge and pure love of old Theology, give us the names of at least two or three of the best modern fathers of his own Church; as for his *ancient fathers*, we will not be so unreasonable as to enquire after them. Thus brought, through the Doctor's great learning and most unmerited kindness, to a knowledge of those "best fathers, and leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way," whom he so highly approves, but whom, "Mr. S. has yet to study," we, out of curiosity, turned to the works of those standard writers, to see what were their opinions on the subject of an intermediate state. Judge then of our surprise, when we found them all,—'tis indeed strange, yet there are stranger things to come, we found them all, without exception, the very fathers whom Mr. S. has himself quoted at length, and by whose authority he supports his doctrine. This being the case, the whole matter turns on the truth and honesty of these Rev. Gentlemen in bringing forth the real opinions of these "best fathers," as they both seem to admit there is no obscurity in their writings, —Mr. S. confidently appealing to them in support of "his theory," and Dr. B. boldly asserting that "they are manifestly with us." The only way to settle the question, is, to recal these "best fathers," and subject their testimony to a re-examination. Having done this, we shall leave to others to decide on the degree of justice the Doctor has rendered, we will not say to the "best fathers," nor yet to Mr. S., but to himself, and of the extent of his respect, not merely for the rule—"Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you," but for the command, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

With the "best fathers" of the Episcopal Church, in this country, such as Bishops Seabury, white and Hobart, we need have no further trouble, they being all high churchmen, strong advocates of an intermediate place, and of course, in a "wrong position," the Doctor is resolutely, heroically and vehemently against them. We will therefore go, at once, to the venerable Mother of the American Church, the Church of England, and see what her fathers say on this subject. And here, we shall avail ourselves of the "Catena Patrum," as given by Mr. S. in the appendix to his sermon. He has there, in addition to the testimony of several other standard writers of the English Church, embodied the opinions of twelve distinguished individuals, ranking among the highest dignitaries and ablest writers of that church, and furnishing a connected chain of testimony on the subject of an intermediate state from 1612, down to the present time, a period of nearly two hundred and fifty years. Their names, in the order they stand in the Appendix, are as follows:—Bp. Pearson, Bp. Bull, Bp. Burnet, Doct. Wall, Dean Stanhope, Dr. Wheatly, Archbishop Secker, Bp. Newton, Jones of Nayland, Bp. Horne, Bp. Horsley, and Bp. Mant. These distinguished Fathers and writers do all, according to Mr. S. declare themselves in favor, not only of an intermediate state, but of an intermediate *place*. And it may not be amiss to remark, that these Fathers of the English Church seem to have been selected by Mr. S. not because they are the only writers of the same opinion on this subject, but because, living at different and distant periods, they furnish an unbroken chain of testimony through the long period of nearly two and a half centuries. But as all these do not, at least, in the Doctor's opinion, rank among the "best Fathers and leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way," it becomes necessary, however invidious it may appear, to designate the Doctor's favorites, and to assign the reason for this, their enviable distinction. From the Doctor's most cordial anathema then, of high churchmen, their inexcusable ignorance, wrong position, bad logic, and all, he provisionally excepts—we cannot but fancy we see our readers smile, as we give the list, Bp. Bull, Dean Stanhope, Dr. Wheatly, Archbishop Secker, Bp. Newton and Bp. Mant; while the very satisfactory reason for his gracious dispensation in their favor, the Doctor gives in these brief, but pregnant words—"They are manifestly with us." The rest, Bp. Pearson, Bp. Burnet, Doct. Wall, Jones of Nayland, Bp. Horne, and Bp. Horsley, being all, like the Fathers of the American Church, incorrigibly high churchmen, are absolutely condemned. The Doctor has given his voice against them. We are therefore relieved from all further concern with their opinions. There is left then, to re-examine but the testimony of

those few of the "best fathers" whom the Doctor has *conditionally* taken into favor. We say *conditionally*, for it is but fair to state, that the Doctor has not pronounced definitively upon all, even of these his favorites. He excepts them from the general anathema resting upon all high churchmen, no farther than they are consistent with themselves: and let it be remembered, they are consistent with themselves only so far as they agree with Doctor Brownlee.

It must also be distinctly understood, that the consistency of these "best fathers" with themselves, and of course, their continuance in the Doctor's favor, depend entirely upon their denying the existence of an intermediate *place*. On this single point, are suspended alike the Doctor's smiles, and their distinction. On so small a thing hangs all their greatness!

That these "best fathers are all manifestly with him," the Doctor, with great apparent fairness, and it would seem, with much gratitude too, is willing to rest on the testimony furnished by his "opponents." What can be more fair or honorable? We cannot but think, however, it would have been no more than prudent on the part of the Doctor, to have, at least, looked into some of these best fathers, before he received them even conditionally into favor; and we regret, on his account, that he did not take this precaution; as from this great willingness to trust all to his opponents, in connection with the fact, that all his references—little things in which the Doctor places great value, authors, vols. page, edition, typographical errors and all, are taken from Mr. S.'s appendix, some may be ill natured enough to suspect that the Doctor has never seen these fathers, he has pronounced the best. This, however, is of no sort of consequence. Whether the Doctor has seen them or not, no one doubts his ability to judge, and pronounce dogmatically, not only of their contents, but also of their merits. He therefore says most magnanimously:—*

"We accept of the quotations of these Theologians, as given by Hobart and Sherwood, &c. and thank them for helping our cause."

As the Doctor reposes so much confidence in his "opponents," it will be necessary, in order that his real regard for fairness, justice and truth, may be rightly appreciated, to repeat, at some length, these quotations, especially those furnished by Mr. S. lest he be thought to have been instrumental in leading the Doctor into an error; for, although the references are all the same, the quotations are amazingly different. And here, as we have to deal only with simple facts, the naked assertion—with indeed but a single word of these writers; and as we shall be obliged to put the Doctor's veracity to a yet further, and some-

*See Chris. Intel., Dec. 21, 1839, No. III.

what more direct and severe test, we must beg particular attention to this part of his review. It is, we hope and believe, a rare specimen of polemick honesty and skill; and to do it any thing like justice, it must be given entire:—here it is, italics and capitals, all the Doctor's—*

"The leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way, are manifestly with us. For instance, Dean Stanhope says,—'The soul lives in a separate STATE from the body, and such a STATE as is susceptible of happiness or misery.'

Dr. Wheatly says,—'The interval between death and the end of the world, is a STATE—not *place*—a STATE of expectation and imperfect bliss.' Then he adds that the completion and perfection of their happiness takes place at the last day.—(On the Com. Prayer—p. 304—Boston edition of 1825.)

Archbishop Secker thus writes:—'Hades means the invisible world, one part or other of which, the souls of the deceased, whether good or bad, inhabit. And he adds, that saints are there 'waiting for a still more perfect happiness at the last day.—(Secker on the Catechism, sec. IX.

Bishop Newton says,—'The separate souls are happy or miserable; but not so miserable nor happy, as they shall be at the resurrection.—(On Intermediate state, vol. III. pp. 559, 661. London edit.)

Bishop Mant, as quoted by Mr. Sherwood—(Mr. S. we suppose, did not quote the other writers!) is decidedly of orthodox belief—'The intermediate STATE,—he does not say *place*, is one of rest and repose. He adds, that will be succeeded by another state of perfect happiness at the last day.—(Happiness of the Blessed, p. 10.)

In a word, the ancient and sound fathers of this venerable section of the Reformed Church, do, to a man, believe as do the compeers of other Churches. But the party of the high churchmen within her, and those approximating to Romanism, do, to a man, advocate this *quasi* purgatory of an intermediate place of souls, *not* perfect in holiness."

Such is the Doctor's brief and pithy account of the opinions of "the leading divines, and of the ancient and sound fathers" of the English Church, in relation to the departed. In this statement the Doctor has certainly made a bold and matchless, yet most melancholy effort to vanquish the truth; and we confess that we look at it, and contemplate it with unfeigned amazement and sorrow. We give this statement first, that our readers, having it before them, may be enabled to examine it, and compare it with the real quotations made by Mr. S. in the Appendix to his sermon, and which, with the references to their respective authors, are here transcribed.†

We must here particularly beg our readers to take along with them, and keep in mind, the ominous sentence with which the Doctor commences the foregoing marvellous paragraph—"The leading divines,"—meaning Bp. Bull, Dean Stanhope, Doct. Wheatly, Archbishop Secker, Bp. Newton, and Bp. Mant—"These leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839. No. III.

†See appendix to Mr. S.'s sermon, on Inter. State, pp. 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.

old way, are manifestly with us :” that is, these writers all agree with Doctor Brownlee, in denying an intermediate place.

Now this direct, positive, and often repeated assertion, we say, is not true. We will prove that the Doctor knew that it was not true, when he made it. We will prove that not one of the above mentioned fathers is with him on this subject. And we will prove that he has deliberately falsified them all.

Reversing the order in which the Doctor has mentioned these fathers, we will begin with Bp. Mant, who, as quoted by Mr. S. says,

“That the intermediate state of the souls of the righteous is one of *rest and repose* : not however of insensibility, but of consciousness, and of positive and great enjoyment : still that it will be succeeded by *another state* of yet superior happiness, when the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed ; and when the crown of righteousness, heretofore laid up for all those who love the Lord’s appearing, shall be given to them by the Lord the righteous judge, in the presence of assembled men and angels, on that day.”*

Now it is freely admitted that, in this quotation, the word *place* is not found ; but that it must be inferred, and that Bp. Mant maintains an intermediate place, are evident from this very passage. We should like to have the learned Doctor explain how there can be *rest and repose* without place. That, by this state of rest and repose, of positive and great enjoyment, the Bishop does not mean heaven, is manifest, for this state, he says, is to be succeeded by another of superior happiness, when the trumpet shall sound, when the dead shall be raised, and we shall be changed, that is, at the last day. If therefore this state of rest and repose be heaven, we should like to know, by what name that other state of superior happiness, which is to succeed, must be called. That Bp. Mant holds an intermediate place, and uses the word state to denote that place, is evident from the slightest inspection of his work. And this Mr. S. would doubtless have shown, could he have anticipated any thing like this “ contemptible quibble,” as it has been justly characterized, “ about state and place.”

To satisfy the Doctor, however, as well as to show him, how much safer it is to look into authors himself, than to trust to the fairest quotations, let Bp. Mant speak for himself. Commenting on the words of our Saviour to the penitent thief, he says,†

“Paradise was the name of that PLACE of happiness, to which the Jews supposed the souls of the pious to be conveyed on their separation from their bodies. To be admitted into that PLACE, to be received withal into the society of the Redeemer, cannot but signify an admission to a state of enjoyment.”

*Happiness of the Blessed, p. 10.

†Happiness of the Blessed, p. 8.

Verily, the Bishop must be inconsistent with himself. He certainly does not agree with Doctor B. and must, for aught we see, forfeit his high distinction. He has, however, no one to blame but himself. The Doctor has done all he could to retain him in favor. He has misrepresented him, told an absolute untruth about him, and to give it emphasis, has printed it in italics. He asserts positively "he does not say *place*." The Bishop, however, is incorrigible; he declares that he does say *place*, and that he means *place*. Willing, therefore, or unwilling, Bp. Mant must be expunged from the Doctor's list of the "best fathers!" He is manifestly against him.

The next of the Doctor's "best fathers," and "leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way," is Bp. Newton, who as quoted by Mr. S. says,*

"Though the separate souls are happy or miserable, yet are they not so happy, nor so miserable as they will be after the resurrection. Again, the intermediate state is certainly a state of happiness not yet complete and perfect in all its parts. Christ says that Lazarus was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom, and the soul of the penitent thief he brought with himself into Paradise; but by Paradise and Abraham's bosom, the ancients, both Jews and Christians, did not understand the kingdom of heaven, the supreme glory, and the beatific vision of God, but only the state and PLACE of separate good souls waiting for their resurrection. And indeed we are all along directed in scripture to expect our final retribution only at the day of judgment. But what occasion is there for a day of judgment, if the sentence is already passed and executed? Why should men be called to render an account of those actions, for which they received their full reward or punishment? Certainly it would be an unnecessary process, and solemnity without signification, if there should not then be made an addition, a very considerable addition, to the happiness of the good and to the misery of the wicked."

We must now beg our readers to compare the above with the Doctor's two line account of Bp. Newton's opinions, professedly taken from this quotation. The Bishop says, the souls of the righteous are in Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, and declares, that by Paradise, and Abraham's bosom, the ancients, both Jews and Christians, did not understand heaven, the supreme glory, and beatific vision of God; but *only* the state and PLACE of separate souls waiting for their resurrection. Doctor B. then, in thus withholding from his readers the Bishop's language, has wilfully misrepresented him. And we strongly suspect that, had the Doctor been as anxious for the truth, as for a display of references, or had even known any thing of the original work, the good Bishop would hardly have found a

*Intermediate State, vol. III. pp. 659, 661. Lond. Ed. Had the Doctor quoted from the Bishop's works, he might have avoided, in his favorite article of references, the typographical blunder, into which he has been led by copying from Mr. S. For the benefit of the future editions of this review, it may not be amiss to state that the pages here indicated are the right references.

place among the "best fathers;" as one of the objects of his LVII dissertation, is to prove that Paradise is not heaven. And he not only uses the word *place* to denote the separate state, but almost every other word, by which place can be designated. Bp. Newton, therefore, must be struck from the list of the "best fathers"—Doct. B. is manifestly against him.

The next "best father" is Archbishop Secker, who, as quoted by Mr. S. says,*

"The most common meaning, not only among the heathens, but Jews and Christians, of the word *Hades*, here translated Hell, was in general, that invisible world, one part or another of which, the souls of the deceased, whether good or bad, inhabit. And this, however strange it might seem to the unlearned, yet is by others acknowledged. Probably, therefore, all that was intended to be taught by the expression before us (he descended into hell,) is, that when our Saviour died, and his body was laid in the grave, so his spirit went *where other separate spirits are*. And we should remember, in repeating these words of the Creed, that this is the whole of what we are bound to profess by them. But in what part of space, or of what nature that *receptacle* is, in which the souls of men continue from their death until they rise again, we scarce know at all; excepting that we are sure *it is divided into two extremely different regions, the dwelling of the righteous, called in St. Luke, Abraham's bosom, where Lazarus was; and that of the wicked, where the rich man was; 'between which there is a great gulf fixed.'* And we have no proof that our Saviour went on any account into the *latter*: but since he told the penitent thief, that he should be 'that day with him in Paradise,' we are certain he was in the *former*: *where they which die in the Lord, rest from their labors and are blessed; waiting for a still more perfect happiness at the resurrection of the last day.'*"

Here again, we must request of our readers a particular comparison of this quotation with the Doctor's extract from it. He selects one word *here*, and other words *there, making in all two whole lines and two words*, from the beginning of the quotation, and then passing over—on the principle, we suppose, of denying an intermediate place—the whole of the intervening part, and takes *one whole line and one whole word*, from its close. And yet the Doctor can talk about garbling! The word *place*, however, it must be confessed, is not to be found in the whole quotation, and this was enough for the Doctor. But as the Archbishop has used the words, *Hades, invisible world, divided into two parts, two extremely different regions, receptacle, Paradise, Abraham's bosom, &c.* to denote the residence of departed souls, we suppose any one but Doct. B. will admit that, by these terms, the Archbishop intended to denote a place. We think, therefore, his name must also be erased from among those of the "best fathers;" for as manifestly as the Doctor has willfully misrepresented the Archbishop's language, and deliberately rendered a false account of his sentiments, so *manifestly* is he against him.

*On the Catechism, Lee. IX.

We come next to Doct. Wheatly, who, as quoted by Mr. S. says,*

"The ancients all agree in this, that the interval between death and the end of the world, is a state of expectation and imperfect bliss, in which the souls of the righteous wait for the completion and perfection of their happiness at the consummation of all things."

Now, as this is but a short quotation, the Doctor might as well have given the whole of it, more especially so, as it speaks of a sort of agreement among the ancients, for whose opinions, he entertains such a peculiar respect. He has here, however, done pretty well; for it must be admitted that the word place is not seen in the quotation, though, as in that from Bp. Mant, it is necessarily implied. Mr. S. probably, did not think it necessary to look for passages having in them the word place. His object was to prove that souls did not, at death, go immediately to heaven. And taking it for granted that no well read theologian could be ignorant of Wheatly's opinion on this subject, he deemed this short quotation all sufficient. And we cannot but think that, had the Doctor ever looked into Wheatly, or had even the slightest knowledge of his sentiments, he would have been a little more cautious, if not a little less confident. But prudence and modesty are virtues, to which the Doctor is a stranger. As, however, he has made this father say *STATE* in capitals; and, as if this was not enough, *not place*, in emphatic italics, it will be necessary to let Doct. Wheatly again speak for himself.

"The promise of our Saviour to the thief on the cross, can imply no more than that he should on that very day, on which he died, enter into that PLACE of rest and quiet, where the souls of the righteous wait for the resurrection. And indeed, that our Saviour *could not mean heaven by Paradise*, is plain enough; because he himself did not ascend into the upper heavens till after his resurrection; as we every day profess to believe in our Creed; in which we declare that whilst, as to his body, 'he was dead and buried,' as to his spirit or soul, 'he descended into hell.'"

Such then, being the sentiments of Doct. Wheatly, when allowed to speak for himself, we see not but that he also must lose his place among the "best fathers;"—the Doctor's assertion, capitals and italics, to the contrary notwithstanding;—he is manifestly against him.

The next of the "best fathers," in order, is Dean Stanhope, who, as quoted by Mr. S. says,†

"The human soul is a *substance* distinct from the body; that it lives after it in a separate state from it, and such a state, as is susceptible of happiness or misery,—and that the souls of good men enter upon *some degree of bliss*, immediately after their departure out of the body."

*On the Com. Prayer, p. 304, Boston edition, 1825.

†Gos. for Thursday before Easter.

From this quotation, the Doctor, in his righteous abhorrence of garbling, has made out two whole lines, and the word "STATE," at least twice, in capitals; though that of place he could not find. Even here, however, place is clearly implied. The soul being a *substance*, seems necessarily to require a place for its existence. And by declaring that, while separated from the body, it is susceptible of happiness or misery, and enters, if good, upon *some degree of bliss*, the Dean clearly intimates that the place of the soul, in this state of separation, is not heaven, the place of *perfect happiness and bliss*. And we can answer for it, had Mr. S. known how much consequence the Doctor attaches to this little word place, he would have satisfied him, to his heart's content. For he had only to cite the sentence in immediate connection with the foregoing, and leave the Doctor to answer, as he might, the Dean's pertinent interrogatory—

"Why is the spirit here the object of our Lord's care, and deposited in God's hands; but because those phrases are set to signify a PLACE of safety from danger?"

There goes, then, the good Dean from the Doctor's favor. Really, we fear the Doctor will lose all his "best fathers!" There is but one left. That one, however, is the famous Bp. Bull. This pre-eminently distinguished father and writer, as quoted by Mr. S. says,*

"I do affirm the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive Church to be this: That the souls of all the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a PLACE and state of bliss, far exceeding all the felicities of this world, though short of that most consummate, perfect beatitude of Heaven, with which they are to be crowned and rewarded in the resurrection. And so on the contrary, that the souls of all the wicked are presently after death in a state of very great misery; and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment."

Doct. B. has the same passage. And much are we gratified, at being able to give him credit for having once quoted Mr. S. correctly and entirely. We must confess, however, that we are somewhat at loss—and we doubt not our readers, when they have looked at the passage, will be equally so—to discover any very good reason for the Doctor's great partiality for Bp. Bull, and especially for the singular confidence, and apparent delight, with which he appeals to him. And although we were, at first, a little startled, lest, through the Doctor's Sampson-like performance, we should lose the good Bishop entirely, yet we could not but smile at the ease and self-complacency, with which the Doctor plays the giant. Just hear him.†

"We rejoice that we can carry off Bishop Bull from the camp of the enemies' hosts. (Unless, like the Greek and Latin Fathers, he wants unanimous consent with his own self, in his own writings.)"

*Ser. on Middle Place.

†See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839. No. III.

That is, Doctor B. will carry off Bp. Bull, unless he is inconsistent with himself in his own writings;—in other words, unless he disagrees with the Doctor! Truly, the Bishop is in a hard case. He must, it seems, be condemned with all other high churchmen, or be stolen away, and carried off by Doctor Brownlee! We think, however, it would have been more prudent, on the part of the Doctor, to have settled this matter of consistency, before he attempted to take the Bishop off. We fear, he will prove a sore burden, too heavy for him to bear. "Bp. Bull want unanimous consent with himself, in his own writings!" Alas, alas, dear Doctor, the very first principle of that hardest of all lessons to which man ever yet applied himself—*ἑαυτον*, you have yet to learn. It is indeed unpleasant to interrupt, or in any degree mar the Doctor's joy and rejoicing, and take from him even his last man, and that man, Bp. Bull, and this too, just at the moment he has him upon his shoulders, triumphantly "bearing him off from the camp of the enemy's hosts." But we have this to comfort us; the duty, however painful, is soon performed. All we have to do, is to point our readers to the very passage of Bp. Bull, which he has copied from Mr. S. The Bishop there says, "the souls of the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a PLACE and state of bliss, far exceeding, &c." We say nothing of the Doctor's consistency here, for of that no one has any doubt, but we do wonder where were his spectacles, when he introduced this passage. If this, however, should not be sufficient to show that the Bishop is safe, there is another passage from Bp. Bull, given by Mr. S.* which, we suppose, the Doctor did not see. It is as follows:—

"The glories of the third Heaven, and of Paradise too, seem to be, by an extraordinary revelation, opened and discovered by St. Paul, not only for his own support under the heavy pressure of his afflictions, but also that he might be able to speak of them with great assurance to others. First he had represented to him the most perfect joys of the third or highest Heaven, of which we hope to be partakers *after the resurrection*; and then, lest so long an expectation should discourage us, he saw also the intermediate joys of Paradise, wherewith the souls of the faithful are refreshed *until* the resurrection."

And lest all this should be insufficient to show that Bp. Bull maintains an intermediate PLACE, and that in so doing he does not "want unanimous consent with himself, in his own writings," we will state, for the Doctor's special benefit, for we suppose he has never seen Bp. Bull's works, that he has two sermons on the soul of man after death, and the middle state of happiness and misery. In these sermons, he lays down these two prepositions—

*See appen. to ser. p. 24.

"First, the soul of man subsists after death, and when it is dislodged from the body, hath a PLACE of abode provided by God for it, till the resurrection of the body." This occupies the first sermon.

"Secondly, The soul of every man, presently after death, hath its PROPER PLACE and state allotted by God, of happiness or misery, according as the man hath been good or bad in his past life." This is the subject of the second sermon.

The "PROPER PLACE" for the souls of the righteous, the Bishop calls Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, and quoting the common and well known prayer of the Jews—"Let him have his portion in Paradise, and also in the world to come, the Bishop says,*

"In this form, Paradise and the world to come are plainly distinguished. According to which notion, the meaning of our Saviour's promise to the penitent thief, is evidently this: That he should presently after death enter with him into that PLACE of bliss and happiness, where the souls of the righteous, separated from their bodies, inhabit, and where they wait in a joyful expectation of the resurrection and the consummation of their bliss in the highest Heaven. For that our Saviour here did not promise the thief an immediate entrance into that heaven, the ancients gathered from hence, that he himself, as man, did not ascend thither till after his resurrection, as our very creed informs us."

But to satisfy Dr. B. that Bishop Bull does not "want unanimous consent with himself, in his own writings," as well as to guard the "reason of his humblest Sabbath school pupil" from 'pronouncing too promptly' against the 'comfort and glory' of an intermediate place, let the good Bishop again speak,*

"This discourse is matter of abundant consolation to all good men, when death approacheth them. They are sure not only of a blessed resurrection at the last day, but of a reception into a very happy PLACE and state in the meantime. They shall be immediately after death put in the possession of Paradise, and there rejoice in the certain expectation of a crown of glory, to be bestowed upon them at the day of recompense. Fear not, good man, when death comes; for the good angels are ready to receive thy soul, and convey it into Abraham's bosom. A PLACE, wherever it is, of rest, and that not a stupid insensible rest, but a rest attended with a lively perception of a far greater joy and delight, than this world can afford. A PLACE of the best society and company, where thou shalt be gathered to the spirits of just men, to the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and familiarly converse with those saints and excellent persons, whom thou hast heard of and admired, and whose examples thou has endeavored to imitate. A PLACE that is the rendezvous of the holy angels of God, and which the Son of God himself visits and illustrates with the rays of his glory. A PLACE where there shall be no wicked men to corrupt or offend thee, no devil to tempt thee, no sinful flesh to betray thee. A PLACE of full security, where thou shalt be out of all possible danger of being undone and miserable forever. A PLACE from whence all sorrow (because all sin) is banished; where there is nothing but joy, and yet more joy still expected. This is the PLACE that death calls thee to."

Bp. Bull, then, is perfectly safe—"He wants unanimous consent with himself," in as much as he will say PLACE. There is therefore no danger of his being carried off by Doctor Browe-

*Ser. on Middle State.

lee —. Bishop Bull carried off by Doctor Brownlee! Pish! The Doctor is too uncertain footed. The Bishop will not ride such a stumbler. He mounts a nobler steed and moves in more befitting style; and wherever he goes, honor, truth and grace attend him.

Thus, the Doctor's "best fathers" have every one of them failed him. They have all become high Churchmen; and being all in a "wrong position, and having fallen and floundered into an argument befitting this false position," they are of course, all condemned—instead of being *manifestly with* the Doctor, they are all *manifestly against* him. What now shall we say of the confident, positive assertion with which the Doctor commences this fearful statement,—“The leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way are manifestly with us!” We need say nothing :—It speaks for itself; and sad is the tale it tells.

We have a few words more touching this “unique and matchless paragraph,” particularly the two last sentences, which seem intended as a summing up—a sort of double condenser, embodying in a small space all the strange things in this part of the review. That our readers may have the matter directly before them, we beg to repeat these two sentences.

“In a word, the ancient and sound fathers of this venerable section of the Reformed Church [the Ch. of England,] do, to a man, believe as do the compeers of other Churches. But the party of the high Churchmen within her, and those approximating to Romanism, do, to a man, advocate this *quasi* purgatory of an intermediate place of souls, not perfect in holiness.”

Now had we not, long since, ceased to wonder at any assertion the Doctor can make, however bold or unfounded, these sentences might have surprised us : as it is, they excite no marvel, except, indeed, it be,—that we are not sure, there is, in these sentences, particularly the first, any *expressed* untruth ; on the contrary, we are inclined to think that it may be all *literally* true. That word “compeer,” we confess, did somewhat puzzle us, as we could not tell whether the Doctor was looking towards prelacy or papacy. But as this is of little consequence, we will, to save the Doctor's rank, and secure, if possible, his Catholic amiability, admit him to be a compeer of either Bishops, or Popes, or of both, as he pleases.

Now if “the ancient and sound fathers of that venerable section of the Reformed Church, do, to a man believe as do the compeers of other churches,” we suppose it must be admitted that “these compeers of other churches” believe as do those “ancient and sound fathers.” But we have seen that these ancient and sound fathers, do to a man,” not excepting even those, the Doctor pronounces the “best,” believe in an intermediate place, “therefore,” on the Doctor's authority—he will pardon

the "profound conclusion" these "compeers of other churches"—the Doctor himself always excepted, believing as do "the ancient and sound fathers" do believe in an intermediate **PLACE**: which we suppose to be the fact. So that the Doctor has here declared a most undoubted truth. We wish it, however, distinctly understood, that we dare not be positive that this was his intention.

The other sentence, to make it speak truth, requires more correction. The word "party," as we have before told the Doctor, does not rightly belong to the Church. And as the phrases,—*"those approximating to Romanism,"* and, *quasi purgatory,"* are mere embellishments, designed only for effect—a sort of catch for the weak and ignorant, and are here altogether out of place, they might as well have been omitted. Divested of these unseemly words and phrases, and made to read thus,—*"high churchmen do, to a man, advocate an intermediate PLACE of souls not perfect in holiness,"* this sentence is in harmony with the first, and speaks a wholesome and undoubted truth, as set forth by the joint consent of "the ancient and sound fathers" of the English Church, and "the Compeers of other Churches."

As the Doctor seems to have a good deal of trouble with the phrase,—*"not perfect in holiness,"* as he cannot understand any thing like degrees in perfection, nor yet discern the immeasurable difference between the condition of a righteous soul, one part of man, while separated from the body, and resting in Paradise, free from sin and sorrow, and its condition, after its reunion with the body, and when the whole man shall be advanced to his glorified state in heaven, we will briefly state for his special edification and comfort, that high churchmen, when they say the soul, in its intermediate state or place, *"is not perfect in holiness,"* do not say, nor suppose that it goes into that state or place, with sin and depravity still adhering to it," or that it carries with it there any *"venial sins,"* as the Doctor, with his accustomed regard to truth, has so positively asserted.*—What they believe, and what they say, is, that wherever may be the intermediate place; whatever may be the condition of the soul in that place, or however perfect may be its knowledge, its holiness or its happiness, it is yet, during this state of separation and divorce from the body, and while but a part of man exists, still imperfect, when compared with what will be its condition, the extent of its knowledge, its holiness and its happiness, after the resurrection, and its reunion with the glorified body, and when the whole man shall again exist in heaven.

That Doctor Brownlee, in asserting that "the ancient and sound fathers of the English Church do, to a man, believe as do

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839. No. I.

the compeers of other churches," has, by accident, declared an unquestionable truth, Mr. S. in the appendix to his sermon, has very clearly proved. He has there made large quotations,—quotations too, thankfully received by the Doctor, from the most distinguished of those compeers,—that is, from Doddridge, Campbell, Watts, and Macknight, Presbyterians; Knapp, Lutheran; Dwight, Congregationalist; and Wesley and Clark, Methodists;—all believing on this subject, as do "the ancient and sound fathers of the English Church." But while the Doctor accepts of these "quotations," it must be remembered, that it is with the same limitation that he accepted those from the "best fathers, and leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way;"—that is, he accepts of them, no farther than these authors are 'consistent with themselves,' or in other words, agree with him. This is the absolute, unyielding condition on which any one, whether father, or compeer, can expect the Doctor's favor. Hence it is, we suppose, that he has passed over unnoticed, Macknight, Knapp and Wesley. These compeers will say *PLACE*, and therefore must have their place with high churchmen. And even the others, though conditionally honored with the smiles of the Doctor's countenance, must ultimately, we apprehend, share the same fate. As, however, the Doctor claims those, as on "his side," though for the life of us, we cannot see for what reason, it will be necessary to re-examine also their testimony. And here we regret that we cannot be as brief as the Doctor. But we have not yet learned his short-hand method of dealing with writers; nor yet have we his magic skill in making them agree with us. Besides, it takes more words to refute an untruth, than it does to tell it. We will, however, be as brief as possible.

Doctor Brownlee says,*

"Doctor Adam Clarke, on Cor. XII. 7, calls it the *place* of the blessed, or the *state* of separate spirits."

This is all the Doctor gives us from Doct. Clarke; and some may wonder, whose wondering powers are not exhausted, why he has given us so much. Doctor Clarke say *PLACE*; and yet Doct. B. claim him as a compeer, on his side! Even so. But it so happens, that while Mr. S. has a quotation of about half a page from Doct. Clarke, where he advocates strongly an intermediate *place*, and says "that Hell or Hades is the *PLACE* of separate spirits," and "Hades has their spirits," he has not given a word from this writer on this passage from the Corinthians. So we must, in return, "thank" the Doctor, "for helping our cause," by giving us this further proof, that Doct. Clarke maintains an intermediate *PLACE*. The following pas-

*Chris. Intel, Dec. 21st, 1839—No III.

sage, as quoted by Mr. S. from this writer, is so Catholic that we cannot resist the temptation to repeat it. Doctor Clarke, commenting on Heb. XI. 40, says,

"Believers before the flood, after the flood, under the law, and since the law, make but one Church. The gospel dispensation is the last, and the Church cannot be considered as *complete*, till the believers under all dispensations are gathered together. As the gospel is the last dispensation, *the preceding believers* cannot be consummated even in glory till the gospel church arrive in the Heaven of heavens."

The next compeer is Doctor Dwight, from whom Mr. S. has a quotation of about half a page. But Doct. B. says,* "it is nothing to his purpose," and further, that "it is a garbled and unfair quotation." And then, after giving these two lines and a half from Doct. Dwight—

'What ever may be true concerning an intermediate place of existence, there can, I apprehend, be no reasonable doubt concerning an intermediate state,' Doct. B. says, "This is precisely our doctrine."

Having learned how to appreciate the value of the Doctor's assertions; and knowing how his righteous indignation kindles against every thing like *unfairness*, and especially when it assumes the *garbling* form, we looked into the truth of this charge against Mr. S. and we feel bound to say, the charge is altogether unfounded. Mr. S. has done no injustice to either the language or the sentiments of that writer. But let us see who has misrepresented Doct. Dwight, and given an *unfair* account of his opinions. That distinguished writer had been discoursing, towards the close of this sermon,† upon the difference of opinion among divines, "concerning *the places where the dead reside*, between their departure from this world, and the final judgment;" and on this subject, says, "I am obliged to confess myself not altogether satisfied." Doct. Dwight not altogether satisfied concerning the *places where the dead reside*, &c.: and yet, "this is precisely our doctrine!" And is it true, after all, that Doct. B. is not yet himself "altogether satisfied" concerning the places where reside the dead, between their departure from this world, and the final judgment? Verily, the Doctor is a very *fair* man! Unable to satisfy himself, "concerning the place where reside the dead," Doct. Dwight goes on to say, that,

"Whatever may be true concerning an intermediate place of existence, there can, I apprehend, be no doubt concerning an intermediate state."

And from this part of the sermon, Mr. S. made his quotation, which consists of three short extracts, and does, as it seems to

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 4th, 1839. No. III.

†Ser. 164, Vol. V. pp. 432, 3, 4, 5. Middletown Ed. 1819.

us, abundantly sustain his position—"that the souls of the righteous do not go, at death, immediately into heaven." And be it remembered, this was the point, and the only point, these extracts were designed to prove. Mr. S. having not then attended to the physics of this matter, was probably ignorant of the fact, that any created thing could have being, without *being in some place*. The following, one of these extracts, is all, that it is necessary to repeat.

"The state in which Lazarus was placed, is denoted elsewhere by the word Paradise. 'To-day,' said the Saviour to the thief on the cross, 'thou shalt be with me in Paradise.' But we know from our Saviour's own declaration, that, when he gave up the ghost on the cross, his spirit went, *not to hell, but to Hades, or Sheol.*"

Now as Paradise, Hades and Sheol, all meaning one and the same thing, must denote some *place*; as this place, according to Doct. Dwight, is "not hell;" and as we cannot suppose, what he seemed to think hardly a supposable case, that any one in his sober senses, will contend that Hades or Sheol means heaven, we do think Doct. Dwight has, notwithstanding all his difficulties, pretty clearly proved an intermediate place. At any rate, if Doct. D. was not "altogether satisfied," the following sentence very plainly indicates which way he leaned.

"The thief, therefore, went to the state, which is denoted by this word: [Hades,] and *not* to that which is denoted by *heaven*, unless this word is supposed to include heaven."

But, we repeat, the purpose for which Doctor Dwight was quoted, was to show that he did not hold the doctrine "that saints go, at death, immediately into heaven, the kingdom of glory." On this point, hear him again, and in this latter part of the same sermon. Commenting on Heb. XI. 39, 40,

"St. Paul says of the ancient saints, *and these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.* The promise here denotes, I apprehend, the good or reward promised to faith and obedience, *in its full extent.* This good, the ancient saints are here declared *not to have received*, in this extensive manner: something better being reserved for christians under the gospel, in which they are to share, together with those, who have gone before them, *when they shall be gathered into the Divine Kingdom, and the state of perfection shall finally arrive.*"

According to Doct. Dwight, then, the ancient saints are not yet gathered into the Divine Kingdom: nor has the state of perfection yet arrived. He goes on—

"In accordance with these observations, Christ informs us, that the righteous will possess *the Kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world*; and the wicked depart *into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels*, NOT BEFORE, BUT AFTER, the general judgement. St. John also, in the 20th and 21st chapters of the Apocalypse, teaches us, that

the wicked will be cast into the lake of fire; and that the state of glory destined for the enjoyment of the righteous, and denoted by his vision of the *New Jerusalem*, WILL COMMENCE; AFTER THE JUDGMENT IS FINISHED."

It is the doctrine of Doct. Dwight, then, that the righteous will possess the kingdom prepared for them, and the wicked depart into everlasting fire, NOT BEFORE, BUT AFTER, the general judgment; and the state of glory destined for the righteous, and denoted by the *New Jerusalem*, will COMMENCE, AFTER THE JUDGMENT IS FINISHED. Does this look like sending souls, at death, immediately into heaven? And if, as Doctor Brownlee says, "this is precisely our doctrine," we do wonder what he would be at, in this, his long review.

The next compeer is Doct. Watts, from whom Mr. S. has a quotation of about half a page; and out of which, or rather, *about* which, the Doct. has manufactured—all entirely new—one line and a half, and, at least, one whole large untruth; and, to make it more apparent, as well as more emphatic, he has printed it in italics. Doct. Brownlee says,*

"Doct. Watts also makes Paradise a state, not a *place*, in which saints are happy."

Now let Doct. W. speak for himself,† and in this very quotation too, made by Mr. S. and which Doctor B. had before him.

"The use of the word Paradise in scripture, and amongst ancient writers, Jewish and Christian, is to signify the happiness of holy souls in a separate state. And our Saviour, entering into that state, at his death, declared to the dying penitent, that he should be with him there immediately. It is *certain* that by the word Paradise, St. Paul means the PLACE of happy spirits, into which he was transported; 2 Cor. XII: 4. And this sense is very accommodate, and proper to this expression of our Saviour, and to the prayer of the penitent thief, and it is as suitable to the design of Christ in his Epistle to the church of Ephesus; Rev. II: 7. The tree of life in the midst of the Paradise of God, which are the only three places where the New Testament uses the word. The same writer says further, Grotius, in his notes on Luke XXIII: 43, mentions the hearty and serious wish of the Jews, concerning their friends who are dead, in the language of the Talmudical writers, "Let his soul be gathered to the garden of Eden." And "Let him have his portion in Paradise, and also in the world to come;" he says, by this last phrase—the world to come, "they mean the state of the resurrection, and *plainly distinguish it* from their immediate entrance into Eden or Paradise at the hour of death."

Doct. Brownlee, then, asserting positively, that Doct. Watts does not make Paradise a *place*, while Doct. Watts himself evidently distinguishes it from the world to come, and says it is certain, that, by the word Paradise, St. Paul means the PLACE of happy spirits, it follows, that Doct. B. has falsified—and when it is considered that the above quotation was before him, we must say, deliberately falsified Doct. Watts.

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1539. No. III.

†Essay on Separate State. Lec. III.

The next compeer is Doct. Doddridge, from whom Mr. S. has three quotations, making in all something more than a page. From one of these quotations Dr. B. has made out nearly two lines. Here they are:*

"Doddridge is not quite decisive on either side. Yet we accept this quotation,—'thou shalt be with me in Paradise, the abode of happy saints when separate from the body.'"

That it may be seen, in what manner the Doctor accepts of quotations, as also, to give further proof, how seriously and conscientiously he deprecates and eschews every thing like *unfairness and garbling*, we will give that part of the passage, quoted by Mr. S. and from which the Doctor has made his two line extract. Paraphrasing the language of our Lord to the penitent thief, Doct. Doddridge says,†

"Verily, I say unto thee, and solemnly assure thee of it as a most certain truth, that this very day thou shalt be with me in Paradise, sharing the entertainment of that garden of God, the abode of happy saints when separate from the body."

Now, by comparing this with the Doctor's two lines, it will be seen, that he has omitted the beginning and the middle of the quotation. Perhaps the Doctor thought that,—*sharing the entertainment of that garden of God*, together with the word *abode*, sounded rather too much like a *place*; and perhaps, the strong language, *Verily, I assure you of a most certain truth*, might look a little too much like being *decisive* to suit the Doctor's taste. Doct. Brownlee certainly evinces wonderful skill, in his management of authors; and we feel confident that no one need scruple to award to him the merit—the very highest degree of "merit of originality," at least, in his mode of "accepting quotations."

But there is one compeer more, and that is Dr. Campbell, who has written a most able Dissertation on the two Greek words, *Hades*, and *Gehenna*, and in which he proves most conclusively, that Hades, as used in Scripture, does not mean hell, the place of torment, but Paradise; and that Paradise is *not* Heaven.‡ From this Dissertation Mr. S. has quoted largely, in all, nearly three pages. But let us first hear what the Doctor says of this distinguished writer: §

"Doct. Campbell is also pressed in by the high church opposition. But he is on our side, *so far as he is consistent with himself*. [The italics are the Doctor's.] Here are his words:—'There is, in a lower degree, a reward of the righteous, and a punishment of the wicked in a *STATE*,'—he does not say *place*, 'in a *STATE* intervening between death and the resurrection.' Again: 'The Apostle Paul speaks of souls as admitted to enjoyment *in the presence of God immediately after death*.'"

*See Chris Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839, No. III. †Family Expositor.
‡See Pre. Dis. VI. part 2. §See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839, No. III.

The above, furnished by any other than Doct. Brownlee, would be an extraordinary quotation; but coming from him, it is only a very common one. In connection with the first three lines from Doct. Campbell, and but part of a sentence, he has given us, at least, three palpable untruths. "Doct. Campbell has been *pressed in*"—"He is on our side"—"He does not say *place*." We shall notice but the last. This—"He does not say *place*," is a monstrous untruth; and, fortified as it is, on both sides, by the word *state*, in Capitals, it would, but for its frequent appearance, be a Capital untruth; nor can the Doctor's very modest and favorite artifice, of making all writers *inconsistent*, who do not agree with him, have any other affect than to prove it a deliberate one. Doct. Campbell does say *place*. His whole argument is for *place*. Nor can you make him inconsistent but by denying that he says *place*, and that he means *place*. But let Doct. Campbell speak for himself:*

"The word *hades* implies properly neither hell nor the grave, but the PLACE or state of departed souls." Again. "Heaven and Hades are commonly set in opposition to each other; the one is conceived to be the highest object, the other the lowest." Again. "When our Saviour said to the penitent thief upon the cross, To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise; he said nothing that contradicts what is affirmed by his descent into Hades, in the Psalms, in the Acts, or in the Apostles' Creed. Paradise is another name for what is, in the parable, called Abraham's bosom." And again. "The rich man and Lazarus were both in *Hades*, though in very different situations. The latter in the mansions of the happy, and the former in those of the wicked."

In short, Doct. Campbell, not only calls the residence of the soul in the intermediate state, a PLACE, but he denotes it by almost every word that is expressive of *place*: such as *Hades*, *Paradise*, *Abraham's bosom*, *the situation of the place of departed spirits*, *the abode of souls departed*, and others, the like, too numerous to be named. But we must say a word about the last two lines of the Doctor's quotation from Campbell, respecting what "the Apostle Paul spake." Not to intimate that those lines do not express our sentiments, and the sentiments uniformly held by Mr. S. but to give another illustration, as well of the aptness of the Doctor's quotations, as of his invincible abhorrence of all *unfairness* and *garbling*. These two lines are not to be found as indicated by the Doctor's reference, but in that part of Campbell's Dissertation, in which, he is combatting the opinions of Dr. Law, and other soul sleepers, who deny an intermediate state, and maintain that all between death and the resurrection is an oblivion.

Reasoning strongly against this erroneous and uncomfortable notion, and rebuking "the metaphysical distinction introduced between absolute and relative time," Doct. Campbell says,

**PRÆ. DIS. VI. Part II.*

"The Apostle Paul, they are sensible, speaks of the spirits as admitted to enjoyment in the presence of God, immediately after death." This, it will be seen, differs a little from the Doctor's two lines. He has substituted souls for saints, and the words—"they are sensible," here very important, he has altogether omitted. Doctor B. therefore, has entirely missed the argument of Campbell in this matter, and wrested his language to a purpose never designed by its author, and to which, he is obviously and decidedly opposed. It would seem then that Doct. Campbell needs not to be "*pressed in*" to the advocacy of an intermediate PLACE, but comes in boldly, and like a man, and puts himself—not on the *Doctor's side*, but in the first rank of "the high church opposition."

Thus we see, that Doct. Brownlee is equally unfortunate with his "compeers of other churches," as with his "ancient and sound fathers of the venerable English Church." He has not one left. Instead of being all *manifestly with him*, they are all *manifestly against him*. And hence, as those compeers all believe with the ancient and sound fathers, as those fathers do with high churchmen,—we see not but they must all share the high churchman's fate. They are all "proximating towards Romanism, and do all, to a man, advocate this *quasi* purgatory of an intermediate place. Doct. Brownlee stands alone in his greatness. He only is right. Every body else, fathers, compeers, and all, "are in a wrong position, and have all fallen and floundered into an argument befitting this false position."

We would here gladly close our notice of this part of the Doctor's review, as we have an inexpressible longing to have done with this disagreeable task of exposing misrepresentations, and of detecting and pointing out untruths. There is, however, one modern writer more, whom, the Doctor has contrived to place, if not in a "wrong position," at least, in a wrong connection. We could, however, easily excuse the Doctor for placing this writer in a wrong connection,—especially as it is so respectable, had he not labored to make him speak wrong sentiments. But it will not do. Parkhurst will not go with the Doctor. He much prefers the company of "the ancient and sound fathers" and the compeers of other churches." Doct. B. makes Parkhurst say,*

"Paradise is, in the New Testament, applied to the STATE of faithful souls between death and the resurrection, where they are admitted to immediate communion with God in Christ, &c."

Let us now see what Parkhurst himself says, as quoted by Mr. S. and let it be remembered that this is the first quotation, which the Doctor accepts.

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839. No. III.

"Paradise is, without controversy, an oriental word. The Greeks borrowed it from the Persians, among whom it signified, a garden, a park, or enclosure full of all the valuable productions of the earth. . . . Paradise is in the New Testament, applied to the state of faithful souls between death and the resurrection, where, like Adam in Eden, they were admitted to immediate communion with God in Christ, *or to a participation of the true Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.* And the Jews likewise use Paradise and the Garden Eden, for the intermediate state of holy departed souls."

Now by comparing this with the Doctor's extract from it, it will be seen that, in carrying out, and further illustrating his holy indignation against all *unfairness, mutilation and garbling*, he has omitted the first and last sentences of this quotation entirely, and also all that part of the other sentence, marked by italics! Does not the Doctor stand alone? Is he not "unique and matchless" in his skill in making writers agree with him? But Mr. S. has this further quotation from Parkhurst, "who renders Hades by the English words 'obscure, dark, invisible,' and gives as its meaning in holy scripture, 'the invisible PLACE or state of departed souls, the unseen world of separate spirits.'" This quotation, however, the Doctor has not deigned to notice.

As this seems to be the most natural place, it may not be amiss, before leaving altogether the modern fathers, to give the following extract* from Calvin, whose opinions, in certain quarters, may have weight.

"The blessed assemblage of holy spirits, being called the bosom of Abraham, teaches us that it is enough for us at the close of this pilgrimage to be received by the common father of the faithful, and to participate with him in the fruits of his faith. In the meanwhile, as the scripture uniformly commands us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ, and defers the crown of glory which awaits us till that period, let us be content within those limits which God prescribes to us—that the souls of pious men, after finishing their laborious warfare, depart into a state of blessed rest, where they wait with joy and pleasure for the fruition of the promised glory; and so, that all things remain in *suspense* till Christ appears as the Redeemer. And there is no doubt that the condition of the reprobate is the same as Jude assigns to the devils, who are confined and bound in chains till they are brought forth to the punishment to which they are doomed."

Now all this looks very little like sending souls, at death, immediately to heaven or hell. But we must confess, that Calvin seems to leave the matter rather too doubtful. We can hardly admit, that after death, and in the intermediate state and PLACE, there will be any thing like *SUSPENSE*.

We are now through with the modern fathers, and the compeers of other churches, and must take a moment to breathe, before we encounter the Doctor's brilliant, catholic and christian-like account of the ancient Fathers.

We have, in the foregoing, avoided, as much as possible, any direct discussion on the subject of an intermediate *place*, and

*Institutes Book, III. Chap. xxx. Sec. 6.

confined ourselves, with the exception of Calvin, to those authors, quoted by Mr. S. in his sermon, and which Doct. Brownlee claims, as on his side. Our object has been simply to examine the Doctor's own chosen witnesses. And in doing this, we have, if not greatly deceived, proved that the Doctor has grossly misrepresented, and deliberately falsified both Fathers and compeers, and therefore stands decidedly and manifestly opposed to them all.

—ooo—

Dr. Brownlee vs. The Ancient Fathers.

We must here again beg that it may be distinctly understood that, as with the modern, so with the ancient Fathers, we design not to enter at all into their merits, much less, to discuss, with the Doctor, the *consistency* of their views, in relation to an intermediate PLACE. Our object is, not to prove the ancient Fathers right or wrong, but simply to show that, whether right or wrong, the Doctor is equally opposed to them. Nor can we refrain from again expressing our thanks to the Doctor for enabling us to give, so briefly and satisfactorily, the proof of this fact. By the summary—not to say christian and scholar like manner, in which he has disposed of these ancient worthies, he has made our task under this head, both short and easy.

Mr. S. in his sermon and appendix, has given, as cited by Bp. Bull, Doct. Whitby, Doct. Wall, Archbishop Magee, Sir Peter King, Doct. Campbell, Doct. Macknight, and others, the opinions of some of the principal Fathers of the first, second, third and fourth centuries; and which, duly to exhibit the Doctor's antagonistic propensities, it will be necessary in part to repeat.

"St. Clement says,—'All the generations from Adam to this day, are past and gone; but they that have finished their course in Christ, according to the grace of Christ, *possess the region of the godly*, who shall be manifested in the visitation of the kingdom of Christ.'

Justin Martyr says, 'That the souls of the godly (after death till the resurrection) remain in a certain *better region*, and unrighteous and wicked souls in an *evil one*: and the opinion that souls are received up into heaven immediately after death, he condemns as a Gnostic error.'

Irenæus says,—'Our Saviour observed in himself the law of dead persons, and did not presently after death go to heaven, but staid three days in the PLACE of the dead.' Again, 'Whenas then our Lord went into the midst of the shadow of death, where the souls of deceased persons abode; and then afterwards rose again in the body, and was after his resurrection taken up into heaven; it is plain that the souls of his disciples, for whose sake the Lord did those things, shall go likewise to that invisible PLACE appointed to them by God, and there abide till the resurrection, waiting for the time there-

of: and afterward receiving their bodies, and rising again perfectly, i. e. in their bodies, as our Lord did, shall so come to the sight of God.'

Tertullian says, 'Heaven is not yet open to any, the earth, or hell being yet shut, but that at the end of the world, the kingdom of heaven shall be unlocked.' Again, 'All such are in hell, [hades] that there are both punishments and rewards, that both Dives and Lazarus are there, that the soul is both punished and comforted in hell, in expectation of the future judgment.'

Novatian says,—Those places which lie under the earth, are not empty of distinguished and ordered powers; for that is the PLACE whither the souls both of the godly and the ungodly are led, receiving the forejudgment of their future doom.'

Lactantius says,—None should think, that souls were immediately judged after death; for they are all detained in one common *custody*, till the time shall come, when the greatest judge shall examine their respective merits.'

Hillary says,—It is the necessary law of nature, that bodies should be buried, and that souls should descend into hell, where they are reserved for an entrance into the heavenly kingdom by the custody of the Lord, to wit, in the bosom of Abraham, unto which a great gulph hinders the wicked from approaching.'

St. Jerome—'Puts this difference between death and hell,—that death is the separation of body and soul, but hell the PLACE in which souls are reserved, either in happiness or misery, according to the quality of their merits.'

St. Austin says—'The time which is interposed between a man's death, and the last resurrection, containeth souls in hidden *receptacles*, according as every one is worthy of rest or labour.'

Such seem to have been the uniform sentiments of the ancient Fathers respecting the situation of souls departed. Let us now see what Doct. Brownlee has to say of those Fathers, and of those who appeal to them. We hardly need ask our readers to mark his strikingly characteristic language.*

"They [high churchmen] appeal to the primitive christian fathers in favor of their novel doctrine. Now, no sober and discreet man, who is even very partially acquainted with those fathers, would venture such an appeal."

Is it indeed so? Not to mention others, were Doct. Mac-knight, Doct. Campbell, Archbishop Magee, Doct. Wall, Doct. Whitby, and even Bp. Bull, whom the Doctor had just now upon his shoulders, bearing off in triumph;—were all these *fathers* and *compeers* not "even very partially acquainted with the ancient primitive fathers?" And were all these *unsober* and indiscreet men? Truly, to borrow one of the Doctor's favorite epithets, this looks "monstrously" modest. But why are the primitive fathers to be thus discredited and condemned? Do they also want unanimous consent with themselves, in their own writings? And are they too, inconsistent, because they do not agree with Doct. Brownlee? This, surely, can to him be no objection, on his own showing. Hear what he says,*

"Gravely speaking, we think we could undertake to prove any doctrine from the fathers; and then, from the same fathers, prove directly the reverse of it."

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 14th, 1839. No. III.

And, judging from our experience, we have not a doubt that, in such an undertaking, he would be completely successful. Lest, however, there might be some wicked enough to question the Doctor's influence over the fathers, thus to make them say what he pleases, he proceeds to illustrate his tremendous power over them, by the following ingenious and conclusive ratiocination. As the argument is somewhat peculiar, as well as profound, we give it at length.*

"First, the works of the fathers have been corrupted by the monks of the dark ages; and many additions foisted into them. Second. Their writings exhibit the gradual approach of these fathers from error to truth; and from truth again into error. They are a kind of barometer to mark the risings and depressions of their minds. They are a diary, in which they enter their progress in opinions; their speculation and faith, from their youth to intellectual manhood; from the manhood of the mind to their dotage. We have a striking instance of this in the two huge folios of the father of the Friends, William Penn. In the beginning of his 1700 pages folio, he is at first, nothing; he gradually seems somewhat *Calvinish*; then he is an Armenian; anon, he is Pelagian; then Arian; then Sabellian."

Now as there is some little interval between the first three or four centuries, and the seventeenth, as well as some small difference between the circumstances of the "father of the Friends," and those of the primitive church, it is possible, that some may not be able to discover the pertinence and force of this sort of proof; or see why the primitive fathers should be condemned, because William Penn began his revolving creed, a nonentity, and ended it in something, if not less, yet worse than a nonentity; and as we do not feel ourselves competent to a full explanation, we can but recommend to those who have doubts in the matter, to appeal to the Doctor, himself, who, we vouch for it, will *undertake* to make all satisfactory, and prove that William Penn was not only one of the "best fathers," but also, if needful, one of the primitive fathers.

Doct. Brownlee then, by his own statement, is manifestly against the ancient fathers.

But lest this should be insufficient to satisfy all, or even the Doctor himself, we will give a few instances, in proof of his assertion, that he can, not only undertake, but really succeed, in proving any doctrine, he pleases, from the fathers. For, notwithstanding, "no sober or discreet man who is even very partially acquainted with those fathers, would venture an appeal to them!" Yet the Doctor says:

"I will select a few specimens of the best of them."

He then gives the names—but little more, and even less, would have been better, of some four or five fathers;—just enough to make out his barometer, and among which, he has succeeded,

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839. No. III.

in getting ONE of those cited by Mr. S. This one, however, is the very last on his list, and lived at the end of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth century. Of this one, the Doctor gives this brief account.*

"St. Augustine says,—We own a heaven and a hell; besides these we know of no middle place."

Now as the Doctor has not seen fit to explain to us, what St. Augustine, or Austin, understood by the word hell, his quotation, even admitting it to be all perfectly fair, does in no way contradict the declaration of this father, as cited by Mr. S. from King, and which has already been adduced. Turning, however, to that writer, for we have not the works of St. Austin before us, we find another quotation from this Father, which seems to settle pretty clearly, if not his meaning of the word hell, at least his belief that souls do not go, at death, immediately to heaven. It is as follows:

"Whether Abraham was in some parts of hell, I cannot well define; for Christ was not yet come to hell, that he might deliver from thence the souls of precedent saints; it is probable that there were two hells, divided by the great gulf; in one whereof, the souls of the just were at peace, whilst in the other, the souls of the wicked were tormented."

The Doctor has also the name of Ignatius, of whom he says,*

"Ignatius, in his epistle to the Magnesians, speaks 'of future happiness and misery :—'a state of life, and a state of death,' without the slightest allusion to a middle place."

Now what we suspected from the positive tone of this quotation, we find to be true. The Doctor has been here again essaying his magic power; and as it will be seen, with most marvellous success. Had he quoted the whole sentence entire—less than three lines, we could have easily believed that he had altogether misapprehended this father's language, and he might have had the benefit of, at least, the plea of "inexcusable ignorance;" as it is, he has cut himself off from even this advantage. The whole sentence runs thus,†

"Seeing then all things have an end, there are these two indifferently set before us, death and life; and every one shall depart unto his proper place."

This it will be seen, differs very materially from the Doctor's quotation. He says,—Ignatius speaks 'of future happiness and misery,' and marks these words as a quotation. Now it so happens, that neither this phrase, nor yet one of the words contained in it, save the conjunction and, are to be found in this whole Epistle of Ignatius! The Doctor has also marked as a quotation—'a state of life, and a state of death : ' and it again so happens, that this word *state* is not even used in this Epistle. Nor

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 14th, 1839, No 2.

†Apos. Fathers, Epis. to Mag.

is this all:—it will be seen that the last clause of this sentence, 'every one shall depart unto his *proper place*,' the Doctor has omitted entirely, and in its stead, has put this whole untruth, '*without the slightest allusion to a middle place*!' Who now will question the Doctor's assertion, "that he can undertake to prove any doctrine from the fathers?"

The last of the Doctor's "best fathers," that we can particularly notice, is Polycarp. He has given us the name of this Father, and told us—how truly we shall see, what he did, and what he did not.*

"Polycarp wrote on the resurrection; and Athenagoras composed a treatise on the same subject. Yet neither of them allude either to a purgatory, or a middle place."

With regard to Athenagoras, we will simply state, that we have read of his "discourse of the resurrection," though we have never seen it; nor have we at hand any thing, beyond the usual accuracy of the Doctor's statements—rather uncertain data, to enable us to judge of the correctness of his account of it; but that there existed a work of Polycarp, on this subject, we must confess, was news to us! And we do wonder where the Doctor obtained the knowledge of this fact. If from 'Edgar,' we would barely suggest to him, the importance of a little caution, as that writer can tell some *monstrous stories* about popery, and like some others, we fear, is not always safely to be trusted. There is, however, one letter of Polycarp, his Epistle to the Philippians, which is acknowledged by all to be genuine. In this Epistle, Polycarp says:

"Whereupon I exhort all of you, that ye obey the word of righteousness, and exercise also patience; which ye have seen set forth before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zozimus, and Rufus, but in others among yourselves; and in Paul himself, and the rest of the Apostles: being confident of this, that all those have not run in vain, but in faith and righteousness, and are *gone to the place that was due to them from the Lord*; with whom also they suffered."

Now it does seem to us that, in this passage, there is something more than mere "*allusion*" to an intermediate place. But that the Doctor may see, and if possible be convinced, that he has, "with inexcusable ignorance," misrepresented this Father, we commend to his notice the following passage from his particular friend, Bp. Bull.

In his first sermon upon the words, Acts I. 25, *That he might go to his own place*, Bp. Bull says,

"That to go to one's own place, or to one's due or appointed place, was a known received phrase in the Apostolic age, to signify a man's going presently after death, into his *proper place* and state, either of happiness or misery, according to the life which he had before lived. Polycarp in his Epis-

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 14th, 1839. No. II.

tle to the Philippians, towards the end of it, speaking of the Apostles and other martyrs of that age, saith,—‘*that they are with the Lord, in their due place.*’”

Thus much for the Doctor’s “few selected specimens of some of the best primitive fathers;” and the evidence of his power and skill “to prove from them any doctrine” he pleases.

Let us now see what he has to say about the rest of the ancient fathers. And here, had we the Doctor’s skill in constructing barometers, we think we could make out from his review a pretty certain index of the “risings and depressions of *his own mind*,” though unfortunately marking a much less elevation than the writings of the fathers. The risings here indicated are small, and “far between,” while the depressions are great and almost constant. Indeed truth and the Doctor seem to be antagonistic to each other. They are always in different scales, and so invariably do we find that all the writers, cited by him, whether ancient or modern, speak, in his hands, a doctrine, the reverse of what they inculcate, when allowed to speak freely and for themselves, that it has become a settled rule with us to conclude that, whenever the Doctor claims an author on his side, he is certainly against him. We can account for this only on the principle of the Doctor’s belligerent propensities, and of the consciousness of his power and will to make any author say what he pleases. But to proceed: The Doctor says,*

“The other fathers who taught a middle place, did all of them teach that that place was a place of purgation from sins. This opinion was introduced by them from pagan writers. And in course of time it originated the monstrous fiction of purgatory. Even the best of these feathers, such as Augustine and Ambrose, prayed for *the dead who were in heaven*. . . . Nay, what seems almost incredible, such fathers as Cyril, Chrysosten, Augustine, did not only pray for the saints in heaven, they even prayed for the doomed in hell. . . . So monstrously have these father’s works been corrupted; or, so monstrously corrupted were their own doctrinal opinions.”

Let us look, for a moment, at a few of the wholesale untruths, contained in this “*monstrous*” statement.

The Doctor says, “The other fathers,” that is, St. Clement, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Novatian, Lactantius, Hilary, St. Jerome, St. Austin,—and we suppose we may now add, Polycarp and Ignatius,—“These other fathers, who taught a middle place, did all of them teach that that place was a place of purgation from sins.”

Now to show how utterly reckless the Doctor is, in his assertions, we have only to state that all of the above mentioned fathers, with the exception of Hilary, Jerome and Austin, lived in the first three centuries; and that during that period, the idea of a Romish purgatory did not exist,—yet the Doctor asserts roundly that they “all taught that the middle place was a place of purgation from sins:”—That is they taught

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 14, 1839. No. II.

what they never knew, or dreamed of themselves; and what no one, but the Doctor, ever dreamed of learning from them. As we delight to cite Bp. Bull, for whom the Doctor has such peculiar attachment, hear what he says on this point,—

"Indeed a Romish purgatory is of much later date than prayers for the dead, and is an invention utterly unknown to the Catholic Church for three hundred years at least."

As here seems to lie the Doctor's great stumbling block; for we verily believe he suffers more from this word *purgatory* here on earth, than any Romanist ever did, or will suffer in any place denoted by it under the earth; and as we wish to cherish the love and affection he entertains for Bp. Bull, we will for the Doctor's special benefit, make a few extracts from the two sermons of that distinguished writer on this subject. Bishop Bull says,—

"The true rise and growth of the doctrine of purgatory, is plainly this.—About the middle of the *third century*, Origen, among other Platonick conceits of his,"—alas, for the Doctor's vagaries about Plato and the Platonism of the Fathers, "vented this, that all the faithful (the apostles themselves not excepted) shall at the day of Judgment pass through a purgatory fire, the fire of the great conflagration, which they shall endure for a longer or shorter time, according as their imperfections require a greater or less purgation. And in this conceit directly contrary to many expressed texts of Scripture, he was followed for the greatness of his name, by some other great men in the Church of God. But how *different* this purgatory is from the *Roman* every man of sense will presently discern. Afterwards about the *end of the fourth, or beginning of the fifth century*, St. Austin began to doubt, whether this imagined purgation were not to be made in the interval between death and the resurrection, at least as to the souls of the more imperfect christians. . . . Towards the *end of the fifth century*, Pope Gregory, a man known to be superstitious enough, undertook dogmatically to assert the problem, and with might and main set himself to prove it, chiefly from the idle stories of apparitions of souls coming out of purgatory. *Four hundred years after*, Pope John the Eighteenth, or as some say, the Nineteenth, instituted a Holy Day, wherein he severely required all men to pray for the souls in purgatory. At length the Cabal at Florence, in the year 1439, turned the dream into an Article of Faith, so that now they are damned to hell, that will not believe a purgatory."

We hope this statement of his particular favorite, Bp. Bull, will satisfy the Doctor that, in his positive assertion, that the other Fathers, those who lived in first three hundred years, "who taught a middle place, did all teach that that place was a place of purgation from sins," he has either betrayed an "inexcusable ignorance of Church history," or deliberately declared a known untruth.

Equally unfortunate is the Doctor in his next assertion,—that "the opinion of a middle place was introduced by them [the Fathers] from pagan writers,"

Now the very reverse of what the Doctor here so positively asserts, is supposed to be the truth. It is generally acknowledged, we believe, by all intelligent men, that the religion of

the heathen is, for the most part, but a corruption,—a fearful one indeed, of divine revelation ; and that most of their rites and customs are but imitations, more or less rude, of scriptural institutions. With regard to the point here in question, we suppose, as stated by Mr. S. in his appendix, that “the heathen nations derived their ideas of the place of departed souls from the ancient Jews.”

Campbell, one of the Doctor’s compeers, as cited by Mr. S. says, “The Jews did not adopt the pagan fables on this subject.” And Archbishop Magee, giving the sentiments of Vitringa says, according to Mr. S.,

“That this entire region”—the region of departed souls, “was called by the Jews Sheol, by the Greeks Hades, and by the Latins Inferi. That these were the notions that commonly prevailed among the Jews, he conceives to be fully established by various parts of scripture. . . . From the Hebrews, he conceives that this opinion passed to other people, and became disfigured by various fictions of their respective inventions. Thus the doctrine of the Egyptians respecting Hades, is given in the second book of Herodotus. . . . The notion, he says, was variously embellished by the Greek poets: and afterwards, being stripped by Plato of much of its poetic ornaments, was embodied by him in his philosophical system. Hence again the Latins and nations at large, derived their phraseology in speaking of the state of the dead.”

Whatever influence, therefore, the true doctrine of an intermediate place may have had in “originating the monstrous fiction of purgatory,”—all error is but the corruption of some truth, we see that the Doctor’s broad and unqualified assertion, “that the opinion of a middle place was introduced by the fathers from pagan writers,” is without foundation. The doctrine of a middle place, the Fathers derived, not from pagan writers, but from the ancient Jewish Scriptures. The Doctor has made two other “monstrous” assertions respecting these fathers which demand a word of notice.

“Even the best of these fathers, such as St. Augustine, and Ambrose, prayed for *the dead* who were in heaven. . . . Nay, what seems almost incredible, such fathers as Cyril, Chrysostom, Augustine did not only pray for the saints in heaven, they even prayed for the doomed in hell.”

Verily these fathers must have been much given to prayer ; and they must moreover have had a most extended charity !—But how does the Doctor make out this most catholic and incredible philanthropy of these ancient fathers ? Why, in the simplest and easiest way possible,—a way too, peculiar to himself. He says so. These fathers believed Hades to be the invisible place of all departed souls, and Paradise to be that region of this invisible place allotted exclusively to the righteous. But Doct. B. insists upon it, that these fathers, say what they will to the contrary, believed Paradise to be heaven, and Hades, to be hell, the place of torments. And because these fathers remembered in their prayers, the saints in Paradise ; and because

St. Austin, in the *fifth century*, began to doubt, whether Origen's conceit, the imagined purgation, were not to be made in the interval between death and the resurrection, as to the souls of the more imperfect christians, therefore—most profound conclusion, they all prayed, not only for the saints in heaven, but for the doomed in hell.

We think, by this time, our readers must be convinced that Doct. B. is not less against the ancient, than the modern fathers—and we are not sure, but they will believe that, however “monstrously these ancient father's works have been corrupted, or however monstrously corrupted were their doctrinal opinions,” there is still more monstrous corruption in the Doctor's wilful and deliberate perversion of them.

But the Doctor is not content with making the primitive Christian fathers derive their opinions of an intermediate place from pagan writers, but he says the Jews also received their ideas of this place from the same source.

“From the time when the Hebrews mingled with heathen during the seventy years' captivity; and especially, after their Doctors had been gradually corrupted by the theories of the Greek philosophers under the Grecian empire, and, finally, under the Roman empire, their sentiments on this point began to differ more and more widely from the doctrines of their sacred writings, and the faith of their forefathers. They seem to have adopted the fictions of their conquerors on this point. They conceived that departed souls are placed in different local habitations, or *places*, adapted to their characters.”*

We shall expect to find the Doctor, in his great love of fiction and desire of having all things heathen, next attempting to show that the scriptures are also of pagan origin. At the present let us see what are the sentiments of Josephus in relation to an intermediate place, and who, we suppose, knew almost as much about the opinion of the Jews, as Doctor Brownlee.

The following is a condensed statement of his discourse to the Greeks, concerning Hades.

“Hades is a *place* in the world not regularly finished; a *subterraneous* region, wherein the light of this world does not shine. . . . This region is allotted as a place of custody for souls, in which angels are appointed as guardians to them, who distribute to them *temporary punishments*, agreeable to every one's behaviours and manners. In this region there is a certain place set apart, as a lake of unquenchable fire; whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore determined by God, in which one righteous sentence shall deservedly be passed upon all men; when the unjust, and disobedient to God shall be adjudged to this everlasting punishment; while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never fading kingdom. These are now indeed confined in Hades, but not in the same place wherein the unjust are confined. For there is one descent into this region, at whose gate we believe there stands an Archangel with an host; which gate when those pass through that are conducted down by the angels appointed over souls, they do not go the same way, but the just are

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 7, 1839, No. I.

guided to the *right hand*, and are led with hymns, sung by the angels appointed over that place, unto a region of light, in which the just have dwelt from the beginning of the world. This place we call the *bosom of Abraham*.

But as to the unjust, they are dragged by force to the *left hand* by the angels allotted for punishment, no longer going with a good will, but as prisoners driven by violence. Between them is fixed a chaos deep and large; in so much that a just man that hath compassion upon them cannot be admitted, nor can one that is unjust, if he were bold enough to attempt it, pass over it. In this Hades, the souls of all men are confined until a proper season, which God hath determined, when he will make a resurrection of all men from the dead; not procuring a transmigration of souls from one body to another, but raising again those very bodies, which you Greeks, seeing to be dissolved, do not believe. But learn not to disbelieve it; for while you believe that the soul is created and yet is made immortal by God, according to the doctrine of Plato; and this in time, be not incredulous, but believe that God is able, when he hath raised to life that body which was made as a compound of the same elements to make it immortal; for it must never be said of God, that he is able to do some things, and unable to do others. . . . For all men, the just as well as the unjust shall be brought before God the Word; for to him hath the Father committed all judgment, and he in order to fulfil the will of his Father, shall come as judge whom we call Christ. . . . At whose judgment seat, where all men, and angels, and demons shall stand, they will send forth one voice, and say, *JUST IS THY JUDGMENT*: The rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties by giving justly to those that have done well, an *everlasting fruition*; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works *eternal punishment*."

Such is the doctrine which Josephus, speaking in the name of the Jews, taught the Greeks, and earnestly urged upon them to believe in time, and not to be incredulous. Does this look as if the Jews derived their notion of an intermediate place from the Greeks?

It will be borne in mind that we have here no dispute with the Doctor, on the merits of this doctrine, and, of course, have nothing to say of the correctness or incorrectness of Josephus' opinions. Our only object is to shew that in every part of the Doctor's review, in every position he takes, and with regard to every author he cites, there is a deliberate misrepresentation of facts, and a total disregard of the truth.

—ooo—

Dr. Brownlee vs. The Catholic Church.

From what we have seen to be the unanimous consent of the early Christian Fathers, respecting the souls of the departed faithful, we may learn with almost unerring certainty, the doctrine of the primitive Church on this subject. As however the primitive Liturgies may be more satisfactory evidence of the Catholic doctrine of an intermediate place than individual opinions, we will transcribe the language of their devotions, in rela-

tion to the pious dead, as given by that able and learned writer, Doctor Brett.*

Speaking of the "prayer for the whole Catholice Church, from one end of the world unto the other," or "that for the whole state of Christ Church," as used in the communion office, he says, "As it stands in the Clementine Liturgy, and in all other Liturgies here published, that is, in the Liturgies of the Universal Church, not excepting any one Church before the Reformation, there is a petition for the faithful departed."

"In the Clementine Liturgy it runs thus: 'We also offer to thee for all saints that have done what is pleasing to thee from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, righteous men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, readers, singers, virgins, widows, laymen, and for all whose names thou knowest.'

In St James' Liturgy, the priest having prayed, that 'we may find mercy and favor with all thy saints, who from the beginning of the world have pleased thee in their generations, even with our fathers and fore fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, teachers, and saints, and every just spirit departed in the faith of Christ;' then adds, 'Remember, O Lord, thou God of all spirits and of all flesh, the faithful whom we have now commemorated, or whom we have not mentioned, from righteous Abel unto this day. Make them to rest in the region of thy kingdom, in the delights of paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, our holy fathers; where there is no sorrow, grief and lamentation, and where the light of thy countenance continually shines upon them.'

St. Mark's Liturgy: 'Give rest, O Lord God, to the souls of our fathers and brethren who are before laid to sleep, remembering from the beginning of the world our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, saints, just men, and every spirit departed in the faith of Christ, and those whose memory we this day celebrate, and our holy Father Mark, the Apostle and Evangelist, who shewed unto us the way of salvation.'

St. Chrysostom's Liturgy: 'We offer unto thee this reasonable service, for those who sleep in Christ, forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, continent persons, and every spirit departed in the faith of Christ.'

St. Basil's Liturgy, as used in the Constantinopolitan Church: 'Remember all who are before gone to sleep, in hope of the resurrection to eternal life, and give them rest, O Lord, where the light of thy countenance shines upon them.'

The Liturgy of St. Basil, used in the Alexandrian Church: 'Vouchsafe to remember, O Lord, those who have pleased thee from the beginning of the world, the holy fathers, patriarchs, apostles, prophets, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and every just spirit departed in the faith of Christ. Give rest to all their souls in the bosoms of our holy fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Lead them, and put them into a green place upon the waters of rest, in the paradise of pleasure, where there is no grief, or sadness, or groaning, in the light of thy holy saints. Give rest, O Lord, in that place, to the souls of them whom thou hast taken to thyself, and vouchsafe to translate them to thy heavenly kingdom.'

The Ethiopic Liturgy: 'Be merciful, O Lord, to the souls of thy servants, and of thine handmaids, who have eaten thy body, and drank thy blood, and received rest in thy faith.' And again, 'Give rest also to our fathers and brethren that are asleep and departed in the orthodox faith.' Yet again, 'Be merciful to us, and to all those that are at rest, thou who hast sent thy Son born of a Virgin.' Once more, 'Remember, O Lord, all those that are asleep and at rest in the faith of Christ, and gather their souls into the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.'

*Col. Prim. Lit. Lon. Ed. 1808, pp. 270, 271.

The Liturgy of Nestorius: 'We also pray and beseech thee, O Lord that thou wouldst at this oblation remember the fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, teachers, bishops, priests, deacons, and all who have been partakers of our ministry that are departed this life, and all our brethren in Christ who are gone out of this world in the true faith, whose names thou knowest; loosing and remitting to them all their sins and iniquities, through the prayer and intercession of those who have done what is pleasing in thy sight.'

The Liturgy of Severus: 'Remember also, O Lord, those who have been famous before thee from the beginning, the fathers, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors, John the Baptist, Stephen the Deacon, the holy mother of God, and all pious and just men. Remember, O Lord, all bishops and doctors, who have stood in thy church, and fed thy spiritual sheep with their doctrine, and have converted unto thee those that were gone astray; but especially St. James the chief of bishops, and other the holy fathers. . . . To the souls, and bodies, and spirits of all those, who out of flesh and blood are come to thee, O Lord of all flesh, give rest in the bosoms of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the paradise of pleasure, in the place of rest, and in the tabernacles of the saints,' &c.

The Roman Canon: 'Remember also, O Lord, thy servants and thy handmaids who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech thee, O Lord, and to all that are at rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light and peace, through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*'

The Roman 'Canon, though probably of later origin than any of the Liturgies above mentioned, yet had existence, it is supposed, before the Roman Church had essentially varied from her ancient self; or had departed from the primitive Church.

"Thus" says Doct. Brett, "there is an universal consent and harmony in all these Liturgies; not one of them has omitted prayer for the dead in their prayer at the altar for all estates and conditions of men."

We wish it to be distinctly understood that we express no opinion here of the soundness, or unsoundness of the doctrine of praying for the departed faithful. Our sole object is, to show, that the primitive Church did pray for the pious dead; and that in this practice, there is indisputable evidence, that the primitive Church did not believe that the souls of the righteous pass, at death, immediately into heaven; and consequently, that Doctor Brownlee, in affirming that such souls do go immediately to heaven, at their death, is manifestly against the whole primitive Church.

But as the Doctor seems to have no very great respect or good will for either primitive Fathers, or primitive doctrines, let us come down to the time of the Reformation, and see what the Reformed Church has taught in relation to the place of departed saints.

In the prayer for "the whole state of Christ's Church," as it stood in the first prayer book of King Edward VI. set forth in 1548, or 9, there is this language,

"We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting

peace, and that at the general resurrection, we and all they that be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world." So again in the Order for the Burial of the Dead:—"Grant unto this thy servant, that the sins which he hath committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the regions of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where there is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general Resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous; and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible: set him on the right hand of thy Son Jesus Christ, among the holy and elect, that there he may hear with them these most sweet and comfortable words: Come to me, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom which hath been prepared for you from the beginning of the world."

But says Wheatly,*—"This prayer in the communion office with a larger thanksgiving for the examples of the saints, than what we now use, was left out of the Second Book, [of King Edward] upon the exceptions of Bucer and Calvin, and the words *militant here on earth*, were added to the exhortation, '*Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church*,' in order to limit the prayer to the living only. The substance of the thanksgiving indeed was added again afterwards, first to the Scotch Liturgy, and then to our own at the last review; though that in the Scotch Liturgy keeps closest to the words in the first book of King Edward."

The Church of England then, and her Daughter, the Prot. Epis. Church, in this country have not now in their Liturgy prayers expressly for the dead: it should be remembered however, that they have never formally condemned the practice.

Thus it appears, that, for more than fifteen hundred years, or till the middle of the sixteenth century, it was the uniform practice of the Catholic Church to pray for the faithful departed;—and consequently, during that period, it was the received opinion of the Catholic Church, that the souls of the righteous do not go, at death, immediately into heaven, but into paradise, Abraham's bosom, or some "middle place." The first exception to this opinion, will be found in the decree of the council, or as Bp. Bull calls it, the Cabal of Florence, in 1439, when the Church of Rome succeeded, after a long struggle, in carrying her favorite doctrine of sending saints, at death, immediately into heaven.

Nor has this doctrine of praying for the departed faithful, resting in paradise, any connection with the idle dream of purgatory, as some of the Romanists, and some of the Dissenters so zealously labor to represent it. Indeed, there seems to be now, as there has been, we believe, ever since the Reformation, a class of Romanists, and a class of Dissenters, which, though on the two extremes of error, and apparently pulling in contrary directions, are yet, by the strangest combination, closely united together in their opposition to the Catholic Church, and

*On. Com. Prayer, p. 304, Bos. Ed.

seem only emulous which shall excel in the work of strife and confusion. These opposing religionists were not unaptly characterized by the University of Oxford, when it said,

"Verily these men are like Samson's foxes, they have their heads severed indeed, the one sort looking towards papacy; the other to the presbytery, but they are tied together by the tails with firebrands between them to the injury of the Church"—or more briefly by King Charles I.* "Those men seem to have learned to practice the worst principles of the papists." So that now, as well as then, it may be true, "that a schismatic is but a papist turned wrong side outward."†

Archbishop Usher says,—Our Romanists indeed do commonly take it for granted, that, 'Purgatory and prayer for the dead be so closely linked together that the one doth necessarily follow the other;' but in so doing they reckon without their host, and greatly mistake the matter. For however they may deal with their own devices as they please, and link their prayers with their purgatory as closely as they list; yet shall they never be able to show, that the Commemoration and Prayer for the dead, used by the ancient Church, had any relation with their purgatory; and therefore, whatsoever they were, Popish prayers we are sure they were not."

Wheatly, one of the Doctor's "best fathers," says,‡ "In the primitive Church too their prayers were more extensive, and took in the dead as well as the living; not that they had any notion of the Romish purgatory, or so much as imagined that those whom they prayed for were racked or tormented with any temporary pain. . . . The ancients all agreed in this, that the interval between death and the end of the world, is a state of expectation and imperfect bliss, in which the souls of the righteous wait for the completion and perfection of their happiness at the consummation of all things;—and therefore, whilst they were praying for the Catholic Church, they thought it not improper to add a petition in behalf of that large and better part of it which had gone before them, that they might altogether attain a blessed and glorious resurrection, and be brought at last to a perfect fruition of happiness in heaven."

Collier says,\$ "The custom of praying for the dead neither supposes the modern purgatory, nor gives any encouragement to libertinism and vice. . . . That the ancient Church believed the recommending the dead a serviceable office we need not question; otherwise, to what purpose was it so generally practised? The custom seems to have gone upon this principle, that supreme happiness is not to be expected till the resurrection: and that the interval between death and the end of the world, is a state of imperfect bliss. The Church might therefore believe her prayers for good people departed, might improve their condition, and raise the satisfactions of that period."

"In primitive times,"|| says Mr. Palmer, "these commemorations (in the holy communion) were accompanied by prayers for the departed. When the custom of praying for the dead began in the Christian Church, has never been ascertained. We find traces of the practice in the second century, and either then, or shortly after, it appears to have been customary in all parts of the Church. The first person"—we beg the Doctor's respectful attention to his ancient master, "The first person who objected to such prayers was Aërius, who lived in the fourth century, but his arguments were answered by various writers, and did not produce any effect in altering the immemorial practice of praying for those that rest. Accordingly from that time all the Liturgies in the world contained such prayers. These facts being certain, it becomes a matter of some interest and importance to ascertain the reasons which justified the omission of these prayers in the Liturgy of the

*Eik. Bas. p. 145.

†Pul. Mod. Ch. Eng. p. 503.

‡On. Com. Pray. p. 304, Bos. Ed.

§Eccle. His. Vol. II. p. 258.

||See Oxford Tracts, Vol. III. Lon. Ed. No. 72.

English Church for the first time in the reign of King Edward VI. Some persons will perhaps say that this sort of prayer is unscriptural; that it infers either the Romish doctrine of purgatory, or something else which is contrary to the revealed will of God, or the nature of things. But when we reflect that the great divines of the English Church have not taken this ground, and that the Church of England herself has never formally condemned Prayers for the dead, but only omitted them in her Liturgy, we may perhaps think that there are some other reasons to justify that omission.

"The true justification of the Church of England is to be found in her zeal for the purity of the christian faith, and for the welfare of all her members. It is too well known that the erroneous doctrine of Purgatory had crept into the Western Church, and was held by many of the clergy and people. Prayers for the departed were represented as an absolute proof that the Church had always held the doctrine of Purgatory. The deceitfulness of this argument,"—we beg the Doctor's special attention to these remarks of Mr. Palmer, "The deceitfulness of this argument can only be estimated by the fact, that many persons at this day, who deny the doctrine of purgatory, *assert positively*, that the custom of praying for the departed infers a belief in Purgatory. If persons of education are deceived by this argument, which has been a hundred times refuted, how is it possible that the uneducated classes could ever have got rid of the persuasion that their church held the doctrine of Purgatory, if prayers for the departed had been continued in the Liturgy. Would not this custom, in fact, have rooted the error of purgatory in their minds? If then the Church of England omitted public prayer for the departed saints, it was to remove the errors and superstitions of the people, and to preserve the purity of the christian church. . . .

"It was therefore relinquished, and the happy consequence was, that *all the people gradually became free from the error of Purgatory*. Thence forward the Catholic doctrine prevailed in England, that the righteous after death are immediately translated to a region of peace, refreshment, and joy; while the wicked are consigned to a place of torment from whence there is no escape. And, *when the doctrine of purgatory had been extirpated*, the English Church restored the commemoration of saints departed in the Liturgy, (viz. at the end of the prayer for the church militant;) which had been omitted for many years, from the same cautious and pious regard to the souls of her children."

To what now is to be attributed the Doctor's confident and often repeated assertion, that the doctrine of an intermediate place is a "*novel doctrine*?" We know of but two causes to which it can be attributed:—either "inexcusable ignorance of church history," or a gross and wilful perversion of the truth: and although we have abundant and melancholy proof—the more melancholy, because so abundant, of the Doctor's strong propensity to the latter alternative, yet we are disposed, in the exercise of that charity, which "thinketh no evil," to attribute it to the former; and to say, that he knew no better. To the same cause, we will also, in the further exercise of that virtue, which "hopeth all things," ascribe his mighty efforts to prove an intermediate place to be a purgatory, and his positive assertion, that it is a "*quasi purgatory*." And fully convinced that the Doctor is utterly incapable of seeing the truth, much less of honestly meeting it, on any question where his prejudices are concerned, we will strain a point, and in the yet further exercise of that virtue which "believeth all things," attribute to the same cause,

his "*monstrous*" declaration, even to himself "almost incredible," that "the Fathers,—the best of them" too, "did not only pray for the saints in heaven, they even prayed for the doomed in hell." But where shall we find charity sufficiently large to cover the Doctor's still more "*monstrous*" declaration,* that "the doctrine we advocate,"—the doctrine that saints go at death immediately to heaven, "has ever been the doctrine of the Church of God?" Really, to believe the Doctor honest in this declaration, or that he himself believed it, requires the more than earthly exercise of "that charity which never faileth."

We have seen what was the doctrine of the Church of God in relation to this matter, for more than fifteen hundred years, or till the Reformation. We have seen also, what was the doctrine of the Church of England, immediately after the Reformation. And although in the second Book of Edward VI. that Church omitted the Prayer for the faithful departed,—and doubtless for the reasons stated by Mr. Palmer, yet she no where hints the possibility of saints going at death immediately to heaven. On the contrary, in her Liturgy, and other offices, and especially in the Burial Service, she clearly and unquestionably maintains the doctrine of an intermediate place. Indeed, the Doctor himself seems to have given up the Church of England, and to have admitted that she is against him; as he has no where appealed to her in support of his Popish notion of immediate translation of saints to heaven. He does indeed most roundly assert,—with what truth, we have seen, "that the ancient and sound fathers of that venerable section of the Reformed Church are on his side," but he no where claims the Church itself. Let not however her Daughter, the Prot. Epis. Church think that she is thus to escape. For, so certainly as the Doctor *thinks* correctly; or so certain, as in the most positive assertion, three or four times repeated, he declares the truth, so certain is she to be torn from her Godly Mother, and made to raise her voice against her.

It is due however alike to Mother and Daughter to say, that this can be done, but by the most ruthless violence. Mr. S. in his sermon and appendix, has clearly proved that the faith of the Mother and Daughter, respecting departed saints, is one, and the same. Safely "treading in the steps of his masters," Mr. S. after stating that the Prot. Epis. Church holds the doctrine of an intermediate state, or place, as one clearly revealed, and certainly to be believed, thus speaks,

"Besides the obvious and natural meaning of the last article in the creed, which, in the order and place it stands, shows clearly that, by the '*life everlasting*,' and '*the life of the world to come*,' is to be understood that life of glory which is to *follow* the coming of Christ to judgment, and the resurrec-

*Chris Intel. Dec. 21, 1834, No. III.

tion of the dead, she declares in her Rubric, before the Apostle's creed, 'that instead of the words, *He descended into hell*, may be used the words, *He went into the PLACE of departed spirits*, which are considered as words of the same meaning in the creed."

Now we think the Doctor should have expunged this Rubric from the Prayer Book, before he undertook to teach Churchmen, high or low, that their Church does not hold the doctrine of an intermediate place.

Mr. S. goes on,—“This intermediate state (place) is recognised, not only in her creeds, but also, in her public offices. She neither hopes, nor prays for entrance into fulness of glory, till after the second coming of our Lord to raise the dead, and judge the world; nor yet does she look for the life of the world to come, but as a consequence of the general resurrection, and final judgment, at the last day. In the Collects for the first and second Sundays in Advent, we are taught to pray, ‘that in the *last day*, when Christ shall come again in his glorious majesty to judge both the quick and dead, we may rise to the life immortal;’—and ‘that at his second coming to judge the world, we may be found an acceptable people in his sight.’ In the prayer for Christ’s Church militant, there is this language of prayer and praise,—‘We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples that with them, we may be partakers of thy heavenly Kingdom.’—The object of this petition is a participation in the blessings of Christ’s heavenly kingdom, an object supposed to be yet future, not only to us, but also to those who are departed. So again in the prayers of the Burial office, we pray alike, yet *distinctly*, for the blessings promised to both the intermediate state, and the glorified state:—not only ‘that when we shall depart this life we may rest in Christ,’ but ‘that at the general resurrection, in the last day, we may be found acceptable in his sight,’ and that then, ‘we may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in his eternal and everlasting glory.’”

It is but justice to Mr. S. to call attention to this last sentence, explanatory of a clause in one of the prayers of the Burial office, as the Doctor, with his usual regard to truth and *fairness*, has labored to make his readers believe that Mr. S. has perverted the meaning of the prayer, by putting the word *but* instead of *and*.

This is the second attempt made by the Doctor to convict Mr. S. of *unfairness*, in his quotations. Truly, the Doctor is strict to mark what he thinks, or fancies, or *makes* amiss in others: what would be his fate, were there meted to him his own measure, we leave to those, who have followed us through this review, to judge. The Doctor, however, will be no more successful in this, than in his other attempt. Mr. S. has done no injustice to this prayer, as will be seen by the slightest inspection. That part of the prayer in “The order of the Burial of the Dead,” on which Mr. S. was commenting, is in these words:—

“We humbly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness; that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Him; and that at the general resurrection in the last day, we may be found acceptable in thy sight; and receive that blessing, which thy well beloved Son shall then pronounce to all who love and fear thee, saying,

Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world."

It was in explanation of this, and of a clause in the other prayer of the Burial office, that Mr. S. employed the sentence above, to which we have called attention, and which has called forth one of the Doctor's most profound criticisms.

The sentence, as before remarked, is explanatory, and its object is, to show, what must be obvious to every candid mind, that the prayer, above cited, recognises and clearly distinguishes the two, and successive states, or conditions of the faithful departed, *before*, and *after*, the resurrection; and that in it, "we pray alike, yet *distinctly*"—discriminately, "for the blessings promised to both the intermediate state, and the glorified state." Here stating the general design of the petition, and connecting the different members of the sentence, Mr. S. uses the conjunction *and*, as in the prayer. Proceeding however further to elucidate the prayer, and bring out more fully its sense, he introduces the word *but* and says,

"We pray, *not only* that, when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Christ, *but* that, at the general resurrection at the last day, we may be found acceptable in his sight."

Now can truth, or honesty say, that here is any "unfair dealing?" Has the sense of the prayer been in any degree altered? Will any sane man contend, that the *rest*, for which we pray, on our departure out of this life, in the first part of the sentence, is the same thing, as the *acceptance*, at the general resurrection, in the last day—the *blessing* which the Son of God shall in that day pronounce—the *kingdom* which we shall *then* receive, for which we pray in the last part of the sentence? Must so large a portion of this prayer be made an unmeaning tautology, for the sake of pleasing Dr. Brownlee? And does not the Doctor know, that *not only* is not usually followed by an *and*? Having thus given the prayer itself, and Mr. S.'s exposition of it, let us look at the Doctor's commentary on the whole:*

"There is another sentence in the closing prayer to the same effect: And we quote it in order to point out an instance of unfair dealing in a late sermon written on this subject. It is this:—'We humbly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in him, *AND* at the general resurrection' &c. Hence, the consummation of the last day is exhibited as coming in due time, after the soul shall have been long in heaven. But Mr. Sherwood, (p. 14.) puts the word '*but*' instead of '*and*,' in order, very probably, to help the sentence to utter a tone in favor of his theory."

Now by comparing this three line extract with the prayer from which it is taken, it will be seen that, after substituting, in two instances, a comma for a semi-colon, "*in order, very proba-*

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 21st, 1839. No. III.

bly, to help the sentence to utter a tone in favor of his theory," and then throwing out the word "*that*," "*in order, very probably*," to raise the TONE, as high as possible, the Doctor stops short with an &c. in the middle of the sentence, when there is not even a comma. But commas, or no commas, the Doctor saw it would not do to quote any farther. He found that the rest of the sentence could not, with all his magic skill, be set to his *tune*; he therefore discards it altogether, and in the place of all that follows the word resurrection—"in the last day, we may be found acceptable in thy sight; and receive that blessing, which thy well-beloved Son shall then pronounce to all who love and fear thee, saying, Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world,"—in the place of this, he gives us this matchless—not perversion of sacred things, for we have before us too many other instances of equal, if not surpassing merit, but display of intellectual profundity, and critical acumen: "Hence,"—we hope our readers, if they can find it, will not lose sight of the ground of this profound conclusion,— "Hence the consummation of the last day is exhibited as coming in due time, after the soul shall have been long in heaven." Really, the Doctor is a most wonderful man, and *worthy of the chair of Ethics*. He is a *fair dealer* with a vengeance. He is at times a most rigid respecter of little things; and he strongly reminds us of certain scrupulous men of old, who would strain out gnats, and yet could swallow camels.

Dr. B. however has no confidence in Mr. S.'s expositions of the doctrines of the Church, nor, indeed, in those of any other high churchmen. He thinks they are all "unfair dealers" and dissemblers. For, in relation to a passage in the first prayer of the Burial office, and upon which, after his usual manner he has put his own construction, he says,*

"We suspect strongly that this is the meaning of the passage in the opinion of all high churchmen: for they take special care not to quote *the whole* of this passage, in their arguments, offensive and defensive, on the novel doctrine of the intermediate place."

The Doctor has marvellous respect and affection for the "Episcopal Church of the good old way;" and he is determined to rescue her from the wicked hands of all high churchmen, and restore her to a holy *consistency with herself*, that is, to a perfect agreement with himself. He goes on,†

"The Protestant Episcopal Church also utters her voice, we think, very distinctly against the opinion of the High Church party in her."

Here the Doctor only *thinks*. Are any curious to know why

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 14th, 1839. No. II.

†Chris. Intel. Dec. 14th, 1839. No. III.

the Doctor thus thinks? It is because the Burial Office, contains that beautiful passage from the Revelations,—“I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, Write, from henceforth blessed are the dead who die in the LORD; even so saith the SPIRIT; for they rest from their labours.”

The Doctor, however, soon waxes confident, and begins to talk about doing justice. He says,*

“We shall give another extract even stronger, if possible, than this, in order to do justice to the genuine doctrine of the Episcopal Church, in opposition to the innovations of the high church party within her.”

Then comes, to the overwhelming shame and confusion of all wicked, dissembling, innovating high churchmen, the following *part* of a sentence from the first prayer, in the Burial service.

“Almighty God, with whom DO LIVE the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord; and WITH WHOM the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, and in joy and felicity, &c.”

As the Doctor seems partial to this *part* of the sentence, having twice cited it; and as we heartily subscribe to every word and syllable, not only of this *part*, but of the whole sentence, and whole prayer, we will in order to avoid the imputation of withholding what we believe to be its true meaning, give the prayer entire.

“Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those who depart hence in the Lord; and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity; we give thee hearty thanks for the good examples of all those thy servants, who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labors. And we beseech thee, that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory, through JESUS CHRIST our LORD.”

Why the Doctor did not give his readers the whole of this prayer, a short one of only two sentences; or why he kept back a part of the first sentence, may, perhaps, by those who know his habits, be conjectured. He has, however, now become positive.

“The Episcopal Church is, therefore, decisively and perfectly at one on this point with all her sister churches.”*

Take care, dear Doctor, lest here, as with “the ancient and sound fathers,” you unwittingly declare another unquestionable truth. Seeming, however, to feel that his assertion, to gain credit, must be often repeated. The Doctor again says,†

“In the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the same doctrine,”—that saints go immediately to heaven, “is taught by implication in the communion service, and directly in the following passage in the Burial of the Dead.”

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 21, 1839. No. III. †Chris. Intel. Dec. 14, 1839. No. II.

The passage here alluded to, is that part of the prayer, given above, which "the high churchmen take special care not to quote," and whereby they conceal what they believe to be the real doctrine of the church! Now if any, after all this, presume to doubt whether the Episcopal Church holds the doctrine of immediate translation of saints to heaven, it must be, because they have not entire confidence in the Doctor's word; for he has once *thought*, and, at least, *three times positively declared*, that such is her doctrine. And yet, these prayers, with the Rubric respecting "the PLACE of departed spirits," still remain in the Prayer Book; and all high churchmen still maintain the "false position into which they have fallen and floundered," and continue, by their "unique and matchless logic," to defend "the novel doctrine of an intermediate place."

We have brought forward these "monstrous" declarations of the Doctor, not with a thought of attempting to refute them, but merely to show what sort of "justice the Doctor would do to the genuine doctrines of the Episcopal Church," and to exhibit them as so many additional examples of the boldness and confidence with which he can make assertions which he knows to be untrue.

We might here, in perfect accordance with our design, it is supposed, close our examination of the Doctor's *Contras* to the Catholic Church, having exhibited, it is believed, satisfactory evidence, that he is manifestly and decisively against her.

That it may be seen, however, that the Doctor is, in this matter, not only opposed to the Catholic Church, but is thoroughly Catholic in his opposition, we may as well show that he is alike, and equally adverse to the church of which he is a minister, and to her "sister churches," as to the "Episcopal Church of the good old way." This we will do, on authority, the accuracy and consistency of which, we may be allowed to hope,—we dare not even here be confident, the Doctor will respect,—that is, his own repeated declarations.

We have already seen the very high regard that the Doctor entertains for the character of Bp. Bull, and the great, but certainly not ill placed confidence, he has in the judgment of that distinguished writer, and of all the "best fathers," his special favorite. And in his laudatory remarks upon the following quotation, copied from Mr. S. we have his entire approbation, and indeed, high admiration of the Bishop's sentiments respecting an intermediate place and state. As the Doctor has made this a somewhat remarkable passage, by copying it correctly and entirely, a degree of respect rendered, we believe, to no other quotation in his whole review; and as it contains the word *place*, the very word which has given the Doctor so much trouble, and which he cited this passage to disprove, we think

it necessary here to repeat it. And to show that, in using the word *place* in this passage, the Bishop "does not want unanimous consent with himself in his own writings," it may not be amiss to state that, besides the repeated use of almost all the words in the language denoting locality, he has, in the course of his two Sermons on this subject, actually employed the word *place* about seventy times. Bishop Bull says,

"I do affirm the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive Church to be this: that the souls of the faithful, immediately after death, enter into a *PLACE* and state of bliss, far exceeding all the felicities of this world, *though short of that most consummate, perfect beatitude of Heaven, with which they are crowned and rewarded in the resurrection.* And so on the contrary, that the souls of all the wicked are presently after death in a state of very great misery; and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment."

Such are the sentiments—now pretty well understood, of Bp. Bull, in relation to an intermediate *place* and state. And these are sentiments which, as Mr. S. has satisfactorily proved, are sustained by the Standards of the R. D. Church. With regard to "her sister Churches," he supposes there is more ambiguity and doubt—at any rate, he seems to think the standards of these last, are not quite so clear and decisive, as the Doctor here represents them. He says,*—

"In consistency with this enlightened declaration, the Presbyterian Churches of the United States, Canada, Great Britain, and Ireland, who adhere to the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, profess this doctrine, which Bp. Bull pronounces to have been 'the consentient and constant doctrine of the Primitive Church.'"

Again, "The Reformed Dutch Church in the United States and in Holland; the Reformed Churches in France, Switzerland, Germany, and in the United States, do utter their voice strongly and decisively on this point."

All which the Doctor very satisfactorily proves by reference to their Catechisms. He goes on,—

"The doctrine which follows this statement, is in precise accordance with the statements of the learned Doct. Bull;—namely, 'At the resurrection of the body, we shall enter upon our perfect happiness and eternal glory in our souls and bodies, in the Church triumphant.'"

Bp. Bull then, maintaining the doctrine of an intermediate *PLACE*, and declaring this to be the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive Church; and the Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and other Reformed Churches, "professing this doctrine," as Doct. Brownlee says they do, "in consistency with this enlightened statement,"—yea, "in precise accordance with the statement of the learned Doct. Bull," it follows, on Doct. Brownlee's own showing,—he will again pardon the "profound conclusion," that he, in denying this doctrine of an intermediate *place*, is not less manifestly against the church of which, he is

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 21, 1839, No. III.

an *adoptive*, and her sisterly Reformed Churches, than he is against the "Episcopal Church of the good old way."

Nor have we yet seen the most cruel part of the Doctor's opposition. We had supposed that the Theology of his own native Kirk, in her earliest and best days, he would respect; and did hope to leave him at peace, at least, with his spiritual Mother.

But no,—the Doctor's adverse propensities will show themselves even here! He does indeed let us know that he has heard of the earliest "Scottish Confession of Faith;" for, out of the XVII. Art. of that Confession, quoted by Mr. S. he has, by dint of variation, alteration and transposition, manufactured about two lines, bearing the mark, of a quotation, and in which, he gives us a part of the truth, but by no means the whole of it.

Speaking of some old sect which maintained the sleep of the soul after death, the Doctor says,*

"There were certain speculators at the Reformation, whom the pious divines who drew up the earliest Scottish Confession of Faith, in A. D. 1560, did impressively call '*certain fantasticks*' (*fanatics*) '*who affirm that the departed souls do sleep and come to a certain oblivion.*'"

The Doctor's two lines of manufactured extract, we have put in italics. How it proves that saints go immediately to heaven, or for what purpose it was made, we leave to others to conjecture.

This XVII. Art. as given by S. is as follows,—

"The elect departed are in peace, and rest from their labours; not that they sleep and come to a certain oblivion as some fantasticks do affirm; but that they are delivered from all fear and torment, and all temptations to which we and all God's elect are subject in this life, and therefore do bear the name of the Church militant; as contrariwise, the reprobate and unfaithful departed have anguish and pain that cannot be expressed. So that neither are the one nor the other in such sleep that they felt not their joy or their torment."

Now this article does unquestionably condemn the error of the soul's insensibility and sleep from death to the resurrection; but while it guards against one extreme, it is careful not to run into the other. The article does not hint the possibility of souls passing, at death, immediately into heaven or hell; On the contrary, its whole language and spirit clearly recognise and declare the real, but not perfect happiness and misery of the intermediate state and place, "*The elect departed are at peace, and rest from their labors*" and "*the unfaithful departed have anguish and pain. . . . So that neither are the one nor the other in such sleep, that they feel not their joy or their sorrow.*" How now could the Doctor insinuate that this sound article of his once dear Kirk, in her best and purest days, sets forth the Popish notion, that the souls of the righteous pass, at death, immediately into heaven, and to the full fruition of their God?—

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 7, 1839, No. I.

Surely, the Doctor has been unmindful of the first commandment with promise. He has indeed forsaken the good old law of his spiritual mother : he is manifestly against her. And a man once against his Mother, we are prepared to find him against any thing and every thing.

—ooo—

Doctor Brownlee vs. The Bible.

As the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, we are prepared, by a knowledge of the Doctor's opposition to the Church, to find him against that truth, of which it is the pillar and ground. For, we take it for granted that no one, ignorant of the nature, or regardless of the authority of the Church of God, can be a safe interpreter of the word of God.

Now the Doctor, it must be remembered, is not only an ultra Protestant, but in the interpretation of Scripture, an extreme ultraist. He regards lightly the judgment of others; and even for the good old canon,—“Quod semper, quod ubique, quod omnibus traditum est,” he has but little respect.

Spurning from him the guidance and authority of the Catholic Church, and *somewhat* puffed up with self-sufficiency, he relies upon his own strength, and his own individual opinion he makes his law. Hence, as with the writings of the Fathers, so with the Holy Scriptures, he claims, and exercises the right of making them say what he pleases. He does indeed bluster stoutly for the Bible, but then, it is the Bible only as he understands it. And here, in his over-weening confidence, the Doctor seems to out-Roman even the Roman Church itself; for, although she holds an infallibility, yet, she is not always able to tell exactly where it may be found. Not so, however, with Doctor Brownlee; he has no difficulty of this kind: he is always ready for a decision, and never thinks of doubting the infallibility of his own judgment.

We do not deem it at all necessary to go into an examination of all the various texts of Scripture, to which the Doctor has referred, or which he has quoted and wrested to the support of his Popish notion of sending saints immediately to heaven, as they have, for the most part, about as much bearing upon the point, as “the 1700 pages folio” of William Penn had upon the opinions of the primitive Fathers. We will barely notice the Doctor's expositions of some three or four texts, and this, principally, for the purpose of exhibiting them as specimens of his skill in hermeneutic Theology.

The Doctor begins with Eccles. XII. 7. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." And says,*

"This, as will be more fully explained by the texts to be quoted, (an explanation we have not been able to find) determines that the soul of the righteous at death is with God who is in heaven."

But why limit this passage to the righteous? The language of the wise man is general. All return to dust, and all spirits, at death, return to God. And are the wicked also in heaven? And have we, in one of the Pastors of the "Collegiate R. D. Church, of New York," an open advocate for the doctrine of universal salvation? Take care, dear Doctor, remember, that Universalism is full "half-way house" to Sincinianism! Now we had supposed that souls might return to God, in the sense here intended by the wise man, without going to heaven. At any rate, if this passage "determine" that, because the soul at death returns to God, it is therefore "with God in heaven," it determines that all souls, which have left the body—the wicked as well as the righteous, are "with God in heaven."

Again, the Doctor refers to Luke XX. 37, 38, and cites a part of these two verses:—entire they read thus—"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him." Here the Doctor says,

"Set down with this the words of Paul: Rom. XIV. 7, 8—'For none of us liveth unto himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.' Hence the Patriarchs, and all who lived to the Lord, have died to him. He is their God after death, as well as in life. They are with him; or 'they live to him.' This implies presence with him, and happiness, and glory, as the necessary consequence."

But, if to be present with God, to be with God, and to live to God, be heaven, then, have we again the doctrine of universal salvation. "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, or die, we live and die unto the Lord—we are the Lord's—for all live unto him."

Again, Rev. XIV. 13. "I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." On this passage the Doctor says,

"This testimony is decisive. The dead, who die in the Lord, are blessed. 'They are blessed from henceforth;' even from the moment of their departure, 'they are blessed.' They are blessed from the instant that they are

*In the Chris. Intel. Dec. 14, 21, 28, 1839, Nos. 2, 3, 4, may be seen the Doctor's exposition of those texts which are here noticed.

'the dead.' Their death, and their blessedness in glory in the Lord, are instantaneous, (simultaneous.) Their blessedness, or glory, lingers not until the last judgment. It has already commenced. And it commenced at their death. Hence, from the hour of their death, the souls of believers are with the Lord in heaven."

Were the Doctor's logic here as sound, as his assertions are frequent and confident; he must be an infidel indeed, that would not be convinced by this masterly piece of ratiocination. When the Doctor declared "this testimony to be decisive," he should have said of *what*; and added, *in his opinion*. When he says, 'the dead, who die in the Lord, are blessed,' he repeats a well known scriptural truth. When he says, "'they are blessed from henceforth'" even from the moment of their departure; the instant that they are 'the dead,' he but reiterates another undoubted truth; but when he proceeds to draw his "profound conclusion,"—"hence, from the time of their death, the souls of believers are with the Lord in heaven," he speaks of himself, and gives us but his own Popish interpretation.

Again, John, XIV. 2, 3. "In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also."

Here, after abusing high churchmen most liberally for their ignorance, in referring the 'coming again,' in this passage, to the second advent of our Lord, saying, "this sophistry is founded on the assumption that there is only 'one coming of Christ again,' modestly adding, "we humbly conceive that no one well acquainted with his Bible could have fallen into this error," the Doctor sagely informs us that "there are certain comings of Christ our Lord, which cannot be referred to the last day," and gives the following, as the meaning of the passage from St. John.

"The coming of Christ alluded to in John, XIV. 2, 3, has a double application. He comes at death to receive each of us *personally* into heaven. He comes at the last day to receive us *collectively*, as his Church, into his mansions of glory."

Surely, after this, no one will doubt that the Doctor is "well acquainted with his Bible." We only regret that he did not point out a little more clearly the difference between *heaven*, and the *mansions of glory*, and explain somewhat more fully, how, after Christ has received us "*personally* into heaven," he turns us out thence, and "receives us *collectively* into his mansions of glory."

Once more;—"Another passage on which they (high churchmen) lay violent hands," says the Doctor, is, Acts II. 34. 'David is not ascended into the heavens.' After giving his own commentary on this passage,—a passage, by the way, not cited by Mr. S., the Doctor comes to the following "profound conclusions."

"Hence, it is not of David's dead body that he speaks in this place; but of Messiah's dead body. Hence our Lord said to Mary,—'Touch me not; for I am not ascended to my God, and your God.' His pure and holy soul, had, indeed, been received by his Father, in heaven, in his 'intermediate state;' but he had not yet ascended to heaven in his complete human nature. This took place at his ascent from Mount Olivet."

The Doctor seems to be approaching the *ne plus ultra* of his opposition. The Saviour, after his resurrection, said, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." Doct. B. says, "his soul had been received by his Father, in heaven, in his intermediate state," viz. between his death and resurrection. And the miserable expedient by which the Saviour's words are to be wrested from their obvious meaning, and the Doctor saved from a direct and positive denial of them, is, "he had not ascended in his complete human nature." Now we would ask, did the soul of the Saviour received into heaven, at his death, remain in heaven, or did it return to the earth? If it returned, the Doctor should have said *when*, and given us his authority for so new and important an article of faith. But as he is silent on these points, we are led to the conclusion that it remained in heaven. And if we are correct in this, it follows, that the Holy Jesus, during the forty days, he was on earth, after his resurrection, was without a soul; and that, during this period, he lived, commissioned his Apostles, instructed them in the nature of his kingdom, conversed, eat and drank with his disciples, and finally left the earth, and ascended into heaven, and all this too, without a soul. Surely, the Doctor made a mistake when he said,*

"There is nothing new under the sun, not even in the wild vagaries of Theologians."

We do think, that, in this part of his Creed, he has given us something entirely new, a very novelty.

But let the Doctor take warning from the example of his Friend, William Penn, and beware of the fate of his revolving creed. For, it seems to us, that, in his present course, he is in danger of ending, not in Universalism, nor yet, in Socinianism, but in something even worse than Sabellianism.

We might go on, and give further illustrations of the Doctor's hermeneutic skill in Divine Revelation, but it cannot be necessary. The instances we have adduced are abundantly sufficient to show that, as with the writings of the Fathers, so with the Holy Scriptures, the Doctor has not only the power, but the will, to make them say what he pleases.

We will, in conclusion, briefly notice one or two of the Doctors prominent and leading Theological errors, and wherein, after getting over the high consideration of *self*, will be found, it is supposed, the source of most of his difficulties, on this subject.

Chris. Intel. Dec. 7th, 1839, No. 1.

Boldly and positively affirming the Romish doctrine, that the souls of the righteous go, at death, immediately to heaven, yet aware that they cannot go thither before judgment, the Doctor is led by necessity, or inclination, to follow up the system of the Roman Church, and to advocate another of her peculiar doctrines,—“a particular judgment or decision at the believer’s death.”

On this point the Doctor is very sensitive; and he berates all high churchmen most soundly for their blindness, in not seeing, on their “matchless logic” in perverting this—to him very plain, or rather, by him most confidently asserted truth.

Now, it is an all-sufficient objection to this notion of a “particular judgment or decision upon believers at death,” and especially of such a judgment as shall admit them at once into heaven, that the Scriptures are totally silent respecting it. They give us no intimation of any judgment or decision upon our conduct but that which shall take place at the last day—the great and final day of account.

But such an individual or particular judgment at death, seems to be inconsistent with the nature and character of our Judge, and irreconcilable with the plainest teachings of God’s word. It is a clearly revealed truth, that “God the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son,” and to the Son, in his human nature, even to Jesus Christ, “who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing”—when he shall “appear the *second* time without sin unto salvation.” “Because God hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.”

This being the fact, it would be a question of difficult solution, how, or by whom, on the Doctor’s scheme, were judged the Old Testament saints, who died previous to the Saviour’s assumption of human nature? And yet, another question, hardly less difficult,—how, or by whom, were judged all those who died during the thirty years, the Holy Jesus was on earth? And when it was that he said, “I judge no man.” If then, all those, who died before the incarnation of the Son of God, and before his ascension into heaven, were judged at their death, they must have been judged by some other, than that man whom God hath ordained. And further, if they then, at their death, went immediately to heaven, they must have gone thither, *before* “Jesus the forerunner entered in for us;” for he did not ascend into heaven till forty days after his resurrection.

Nor is this all:—Jesus Christ is not only our Judge, the Judge of quick and dead, he is also our Mediator, our Intercessor, and our great High Priest, “at the right hand of God, who

also maketh intercession for us." Besides, therefore, the absolute want of evidence, that Jesus Christ is *now* sitting on the judgment seat, for the trial of souls, as they depart this world, there is, according to our ideas of the character of the Saviour, of the nature of his offices, and of the order, in which they are to follow each other, something strangely inconsistent, in making him execute the functions of the Judge, at the same time he is exercising those of the great High Priest.

Equally unsatisfactory is this notion of "a particular judgment at death," when considered in relation to the nature of man. It might, perhaps, to a certain extent, meet the case of the soul, one part of man, supposing it to be judged by itself, and to live hereafter forever, without the body; but it could be no judgment upon the whole man, as after death, and till the resurrection, and the soul and body are again united, the whole man does not exist.

In short, this notion of a "particular judgment at death," the Doctor did not get from the Bible, but is one, which he has picked up in some of those "fields of fiction and romance," of which he so delights to talk, and wherein he seems to have taken some rather odd, if not unfortunate strolls. We cannot, however, but caution the Doctor against these fancy excursions, lest, in the exuberance of his imagination, he show himself too fast, and he be seen to be more of a Romanist, than he is, at present, willing to acknowledge. He should be aware that a belief in Purgatory, rests upon the belief of a "particular judgment at death;" and for aught that we see, these two articles of the Romish Creed, must stand or fall together. And if, besides maintaining, with the Church of Rome, that saints go, at death, immediately to heaven, he be found advocating another of their favorite doctrines, "a particular judgment at death," thereby helping to lay and secure the foundation, not of a "*quasi*," but a real purgatory, he may too much alarm the already excited apprehensions of his Brethren, and thus fail of the object of his ambition, by a premature disclosure of his purposes.* For, although there may be yet a small "degree of visibility" between the Doctor's faith and that of the Church of Rome, it is now

*Chris. Intel. May 9th, 1840. The same Rev. Prof. before cited, giving a few finishing touches to the Doctor's picture, says,—His mental organization is peculiar. . . . His want of judgment makes him credulous, and his vanity enlists his credulity always on its side. Pay him attentions, implore the aid of his influence or exertions, you make him your own—heart, hand and forever. Such a one I may love; but I cannot wish to see him enthroned in the portals of my Church, exercising the most important of the functions with which she has been invested by her glorious Head, at his arbitrary will. If a Pope be thought necessary, let us have a Hildebrand or a Sextus Quint at once. Submission to usurpation is doubly opprobrious when there is submission, also, to weakness. Independently, however, of his personal disqualifications, the thing is in itself *wrong—utterly wrong*.

pretty evident that he is in "full career," whether ascending or descending, we will not say, but around his circular creed to that point of submissive adhesion to "Mother Church," which seems to indicate that, but for "personal disqualifications," there will soon be no occasion for the importation of a "Hildebrand or a Sextus Quint." The Doctor has to take but one step more—for which he is doubtless ready, and come out in favor of indulgencies—in which he must have a deep interest, to be fully qualified, so far as doctrines are concerned, to mount the throne, and receive that "triple crown," to the powers and honors of which he so ardently aspires.

But as there are others, besides Doct. Brownlee, who seem to think that, because souls are immediately happy or miserable, on leaving the body, as they have done well or ill in this life, there must be something like a judgment upon them at death, it may not be amiss to add a few words more on this point. Now that probation ceases with death, and that all souls are then rendered happy or miserable, we think to be clearly revealed truths. On these points the parable of Lazarus and Dives—not to mention other parts of Scripture, appears to us decisive. But that all souls are thus happy or miserable, in consequence of having had a particular judgement pronounced upon them at death, by the great and eternal Judge, seems to us to be a mere human conceit, not only destitute of support from God's word, but contrary to its clearest dictates. Still, it will be asked, how do departed souls go to a place of happiness, or a place of misery, without something like a previous judgment upon them? This, certainly, is not an unnatural question; nor can we think it exactly one of those unimportant and curious questions which the Scriptures have given us no means of solving. Sustained then, as we think, by the unequivocal language of the parable just alluded to, we venture to answer, that all souls, at death, go immediately into happiness or misery, in the same way, that Lazarus went into Abraham's bosom, and Dives into a place of torment.

We know, or rather we believe, that there is above us, in the scale of creation, a superior order of beings, called angels. We have revealed to us many instances of their deep interest in the welfare of our race. And the Scriptures declare them to be "ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." And the Church, "the pillar and ground of the truth," prays to "God who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order, that, as his holy angels always do him service in heaven, so by his appointment, they may succour and defend us on earth." Now with these truths before us, from the Word and the Church of God, can it be supposed that those high and

holy beings, "who excel in strength"—"who fulfil the commandments of God, and hearken unto the voice of his word"—who have evinced so much regard for us, and who have so carefully watched over us during our lives, will, of themselves, or by God's permission, utterly forsake us in the hour of death, at the moment we most need their services, and when, it may be, the Devil, with his wicked spirits, is putting forth all his strength, and making his last desperate effort to decoy of force us into his power? May we not rather indulge the comfortable, and as we think, clearly scriptural hope, that the angels of God will encamp around the dying saint, to guard him at that eventful moment; and, his soul being released from its earthly tabernacle, to conduct it, as they did that of Lazarus, to Abraham's bosom: while the soul of the impenitent sinner, bereft of this supernatural aid and protection, is left, like that of Dives, to take its natural course, and to go down, perhaps hurried and forced on by evil angels, to the place of torment?

But, by whatever means departed souls get into one or the other region of Hades, the invisible place, or however they are there made happy or miserable, they are there, and there, happy or miserable, without having had, so far as we know, any judgment or decision passed upon them by the eternal Judge. As then, there is no evidence of any particular judgment at death, in order to get souls even into Hades; and as all admit that the general judgment has not yet taken place, we do not see on what ground, it can be supposed, that souls go, at death, immediately either to heaven or hell, in the strongest acceptation of these terms. And we must say, that these Popish notions of a particular judgment at death, and of sending souls directly to heaven or hell without their bodies, which the Doctor has adopted, seem to us alike unreasonable and unscriptural.

And here, to say nothing of the serious, and to us, insuperable objection to this particular judgment at death,—that it supposes Jesus Christ to be perpetually on the judgment seat,—to be Judge and Mediator, at the same time, such particular judgment seems to be defective in its application. It does not reach the creature man. The soul only is affected by it. But, adopting the sentiments, and for the most part the language of Mr. S.

"Man is a compound being, consisting of these two parts, soul and body. The union of these parts, constitutes man: yea, this union constitutes man a probationer: yea more, this union will constitute man hereafter a resident in the kingdom of glory. At the separation of these parts, in death, the compound creature man ceases to exist. The soul indeed lives, but the body returns to the earth as it was. Now is it reasonable to suppose that the soul, one part of man, is judged, sent to heaven or hell, and made perfectly happy or perfectly miserable, while out of the body, for deeds done while in the body, and by the whole man, and this too, at a time when, from death to the resurrection, the body, the other part of man, is mouldered to dust, and obviously incapable of either happiness or misery? Certain it is, that

the whole man cannot be in heaven or hell, or made perfectly happy, or perfectly miserable; for the whole man does not exist; nor, as a whole, will he exist till the re-union of soul and body, at the general resurrection—at the last day. But further, this notion of a particular judgment at death, and such a judgment as shall then send souls directly to heaven or hell, seems seriously to affect, if not virtually to do away the necessity of a general judgment at the last day. For what can be the object of such a general judgment? Surely, not to acquit the righteous, or to condemn the wicked, for this will already have been done. But supposing a general judgment at the last day, still, according to this scheme, it can be but to do again, what had been done before. And such being the character of the general judgment, it cannot surely, as is generally represented, be an event of such peculiar fear and dread; for it will be an event which can, in no great degree, affect the already determined condition of the children of men."

Speaking of the unscriptural nature of this scheme, Mr. S. after remarking that the word of God furnishes no evidence of a particular judgment at death, giving a brief summary of the proof of a general judgment at the end of the world, and stating, as a necessary consequence, that none have yet entered heaven, the kingdom of glory, says,

"In direct confirmation of this great truth, are our Lord's comfortable declarations to his desponding disciples,—"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." But our Lord has not yet *come again*. His second advent is *yet future*. Those, his chosen disciples therefore, have not yet gone where the Saviour *now* is; they have not yet ascended to Heaven, nor have they yet taken possession of any of those many mansions, which the Holy Jesus hath gone to prepare for them in his Father's house.

In support of the same great and comfortable truth, is the language of St. Paul,—"For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (go before) them which are asleep, (dead.) For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout; with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: And the dead in Christ shall rise first: Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." We are here assured, by the word of the Lord, that those, who may be found alive at the last day, shall not go into heaven before those, who may be then of the number of the dead. For the dead in Christ shall rise first—before any shall be caught up to meet the Lord, or shall ascend into heaven. But the dead have not yet been raised: As yet, therefore, none have ascended into heaven; nor will any ascend thither, till the Lord shall descend with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God,—till after the resurrection, and the second coming of our Lord to judgment.

Again, writing to the Hebrews, and speaking of the ancient Patriarchs, the Apostle says; "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: (the fulfilment of the promise) God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." In other words, God, having provided for all his faithful children another and better state of existence—a state of heavenly bliss and glory, hath so ordered it, that those ancient and holy men shall not receive the completion of the promise made to them—shall not enter into that better and glorified state, till we shall be enabled to enter in with them, that they without us should not be made perfect—should not go into glory before us."

*John XIV. 2, 5. †1 Thes. IV. 15, 16, 17. :Heb. II. 39, 40.

Many other passages decisively against these notions of a particular judgment at death, and of souls going immediately to heaven, might be added to those furnished by Mr. S. We will however give but this one, from the Revelation of St. John, VI. 9, 10, 11—"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren that should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled."

"This text," says an ingenious author,* "should be explained, at least nearer to the literal sense of it than those will allow who suppose that the soul sleeps for a time after death, or that it goes immediately to the scene of its promised great reward."

The same interesting writer, speaking of a particular judgment at death, says,†

"All christians admit a great and solemn judgment *at the last day*, and every one must agree that this day has not yet dawned. Some, therefore, in order to establish that the soul goes immediately to heaven or hell on death, contend as preliminary, that there is a double judgment; one at the soul's departure from the body, more private than the other, and that the second is to be held at the second coming of Christ to the earth, before all the assembled universe in regard to which we have any knowledge. The last is well established in Holy Writ, but the first rests entirely on the assertions of uninspired writers, while those who adopt a belief in it, confuse them both together, so as to render it very difficult to understand exactly what, upon the whole, they wish to establish."

Bishop Sherlock says; "We read of no formal judgment, but that great and general judgment, when the Son of Man shall descend from heaven with a glorious retinue of angels to judge the world." Again, Christ is the only Judge of the world, for all judgment is committed to the Son; and he does not judge the world till his second appearance, till he returns in the glory of his Father, with his angels." Again, "The truth is, if all men have a final sentence passed on them as soon as they go into the other world, it is very unaccountable why Christ, at the last day, shall come with such a terrible pomp and solemnity to judge and condemn those who are judged, and condemned, and executed already, as much as ever they can be." And again, "The sum is this: that mankind shall not be finally judged till Christ comes to judge the world. . . . There is no need of any other proof of this but that, at the day of judgment, good men shall be received into heaven, and bad men condemned to hell. Matt. XXV. And if good men were in heaven before, it is very strange that they should be brought out of heaven to be judged, and to be received into heaven again with greater authority and solemnity; and if bad men were in hell before, it seems as strange that they should be fetched out of hell, to be more solemnly condemned thither again: This would be thought a very odd kind of proceeding among men, and we have no reason to suspect this of God's judgments."

We will notice but one more of the Doctor's errors, and that is, his strange fancy, that Paradise is heaven! This is a funda-

*Life and Death, p. 247, Lon. Ed. 1833. †p. 221.

†Future Judgment, Chap. II. Sec. 1.

mental error; and wrong here, he is wrong, of course, in every thing that relates to the state and place of the departed. As usual, the Doctor is very positive, "that heaven and paradise are the same place," but then, as usual also, he gives but little in support of his fancy, besides confident assertions, and his own interpretation—more correctly perversion, of two or three texts of scripture. Now, to borrow the Doctor's phraseology, "it will be enough, in order to set him right, simply" to give a condensed statement of the opinions of some of "the best fathers and compeers," respecting the origin of the word Paradise, and its meaning in Holy Scripture, and which we have gathered principally from the Appendix to Mr. S.'s Sermon.

"Calmet says, 'Paradise is from the Hebrew, or rather, the Chaldee, *Parades*, of which the Greeks made *Paradisos*, and the Latins, *Paradisus*. The original should properly signify an orchard, a plantation of fruit trees, or sometimes, a forest.' This word is found in three places in the Old Testament, viz. Neh. II. 8.—Eccles. II. 9.—and Cant. IV. 13.

Parkhurst says, 'Paradise is an oriental word. The Greeks borrowed it from the Persians, among whom it signified a garden, park, or enclosure full of all the valuable products of the earth.' Again, 'Paradise is, in the New Testament, applied to the state of faithful souls between death and the resurrection, where like Adam in Eden, they are admitted to immediate communion with God in Christ, or to a participation of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.' He adds, 'The Jews likewise use *Paradisus*, and the garden of Eden, for the intermediate state of holy departed souls.' "

The word Paradise occurs three times also in the New Testament, viz. Luke XXIII. 43—2 Cor. XII. 4—and Rev. II. 7.

But it is not thought that, in any of these places, Paradise means heaven; on the contrary, it is believed, that this word, as used in them all, denotes an intermediate place. And in this opinion, we are abundantly sustained, as we have already seen, by the united testimony of "the leading divines of the Episcopal Church of the good old way"—"of the ancient and sound fathers of the venerable English Church," and "of the compeers of other churches," all confirmed by what Bp. Bull calls "the consentient and constant doctrine of the primitive church," and we may say, rendered certain by the clear and unquestionable voice of the Catholic Church. Still Doct. Brownlee is confident in the infallibility of his own interpretation:—he insists upon it,*

"That heaven and paradise are the same place"—"that heaven is paradise; and paradise is heaven"—"that if there be any difference at all between the two places, paradise must be the principal, and most glorious place in the third heaven."

In reference to our Lord's declaration to the penitent thief—Luke XXIII. 43, the Doctor says,*

"He [the Saviour] did not say, 'I will be with thee; but, THOU SHALT BE WITH ME IN PARADISE! That is to say,—thou shalt be where I am. Bu

*Chris. Intel. Dec. 28, 1839, No. 4.

our Lord was in heaven. Wherefore the penitent's soul, which was in Paradise, was in the heaven of heavens."

We know not here which most to admire, the Doctor's capital truism, his "matchless logic," or his syllogistical conclusion. The truism, however, would have been admitted, even without capitals. That our Lord said to the penitent thief, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," no body doubts. But that our Lord was that day in heaven, is the mere assertion of Doct. B. and therefore needs, and always must need, proof. Consequently, his conclusion, that the penitent's soul was that day in the heaven of heavens, is a sheer fallacy. It is, indeed, directly against our Lord's express declaration. He said to Mary Magdalene, after his resurrection, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." And the Scriptures give no intimation of any ascension but that which took place forty days after his resurrection. Preserving therefore the truth of our Lord's declaration, Paradise, into which he ascended with the thief, on the day he was crucified, cannot be heaven. We will only add, on this text, the following from Bp. Horsley.

'Paradise was certainly some place where our Lord was to be on the very day on which he suffered, and where the companion of his sufferings was to be with him. It was not heaven; for to heaven our Lord after his death ascended not till after his resurrection, as appears from his own words to Mary Magdalene. He was not therefore in heaven on the day of his crucifixion: and where *He* was not, the thief could not be with him. It was no place of torment; for to any such place the name of Paradise never was applied. It could be no other than that region of repose and rest where the souls of the righteous abide in joyful hope of the consummation of their bliss.'

On the passage in 2 Cor. XII. chap. and which has led some to suppose that Paradise is heaven, it may be remarked, that the ablest and best writers, both ancient and modern, think, that St. Paul here speaks, not of one, but of two distinct visions, and at different times. And they all maintain that Paradise is a different place from Heaven.

Doct. Whitby says, "The opinion of all the ancients seems to have been this, that St. Paul was rapt at several times, into several places, and consequently, he speaks of more raptures than one. They say, 'That he was caught up into the third heaven, and was again carried into Paradise'—'That St. Paul intimates he had seen two great visions, being twice assumed, first into the third Heaven, and then into Paradise'—'that by saying he was rapt up into the third Heaven, and after adding into Paradise, he shows heaven to be one place, and Paradise another.'

But as all this about St. Paul's two captures, into two distinct places, Doct. B. pronounces,*

"Loose and inconclusive logic," adding, "this must be obvious to every scholar,"

*See Chris. Intel. Dec. 28, 1839, No. 4.

Let us hear what, at least, one profound scholar has to say on this subject. The following is a part of the Doctor's gloss upon this passage:

"We can see no decisive evidence in the sacred narrative, that the Apostle had two distinct visions; or that he makes heaven and paradise two distinct places. He sets down only one date, namely, fourteen years ago. When he mentions his rapture into the third heavens, he details nothing of ought he had seen or heard. He then repeats the wonderful statement, in order to give it a solemn and impressive emphasis; as if he had said, 'Yes, when speaking on the subject of revelations, and visions, I say that I knew a man, fourteen years ago, caught up into the third heaven; which I also call paradise, into which, I say, that man was caught up; and I call it distinctly by the name of paradise, in order to guard Christians against the whimsical fiction of the Jews, who, without any Divine warrant, make paradise to be a place distinct from heaven.'"

Upon this logical, scholar-like, and masterly commentary, we will not venture to say any thing ourselves. We may, however, be allowed to repeat, in part, what the following small and unlearned men have thought and written on this passage.

And the Doctor's prime favorite, Bp. Bull, shall speak first:—He says,*

"The glories of the third Heaven, and Paradise too, seem to be by an extraordinary revelation, opened and discovered to St. Paul, not only for his own support under the heavy pressure of his afflictions, but also that he might be able to speak of them with greater assurance to others. And the order is observable. First, he had represented to him the most perfect joys of the third or highest Heaven, of which we hope to be partakers after the resurrection; and then, lest so long an expectation should discourage us, he saw also the intermediate joys of Paradise, wherewith the souls of the faithful are refreshed until the resurrection."

Alas, poor Bp. Bull, not only "wanting unanimous consent with himself, in his own writings," but no scholar! The same is true of the Doctor's "best fathers," for they all inculcate the sentiments of Bp. Bull, and like him, were all blind to this "loose and inconclusive logic, so obvious to every scholar."

Perhaps, however, the Doctor's compeers had better heads, and were more learned men:—Let us see.

Doct. Doddridge supposes St. Paul had two visions, and holds Paradise to be a place distinct from Heaven. In his phrase on this passage, he says,

"Such an one, I say, I did most intimately know, who was snatched up into the third heaven, the seat of divine glory, and place where Christ dwelleth at the Father's right hand. . . . And I know that, having been thus entertained with these visions of the third heaven, on which good men are to enter *after the resurrection*, lest he should be impatient under the delay of his part of the glory there, he was also caught up into Paradise, that Garden of God, which is the seat of happy spirits *in the intermediate state, and during their separation from the body.*"

*Ser. on the Middle State.

Verily, Doct. Doddridge must have studied logic in the school of Bp. Bull. He reasons in precisely the same way, and arrives at the same conclusion.

Doct. Watts also, seems to have been equally unfortunate in his education. He says,

"It is certain that by the word Paradise, St. Paul, in this passage, means the place of happy spirits, into which he was transported. And this sense is very accommodate, and proper to the expression of our Saviour, and to the prayer of the penitent thief, and it is as suitable to the design of Christ in his Epistle to the Church in Ephesus; Rev. II. 7—"The tree of life in the midst of the Paradise of God," which are the only three places where the New Testament uses the word."

One compeer more, and that is Doct. Campbell, who must surely, "so far as he is consistent with himself," be a better reasoner. He says,*

"It is evident, that if, in these verses the Apostle speak of one vision or revelation only, paradise and heaven are the same; not so, if in these he speak of two different revelations. My opinion is, there are two, and I shall assign my reasons. First, he speaks of them as more than one, and that not only in introducing them, I will come to visions and revelations;—for sometimes, it must be owned, the plural is used in expressing a subject indefinitely; but afterwards, in referring to what he had related, he says, lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations. Secondly, they are related precisely as two distinct events, and coupled together by the connexive particle. Thirdly, there is a repetition of his doubts, in regard to the reality of his translation, which, if the whole relate to a single event, was not only superfluous, but improper. This repetition, however, was necessary, if what is related in the third and fourth verses be a different fact from what is told in the second, and if he was equally uncertain, whether it passed in vision or in reality. Fourthly, if all the three verses regard only one revelation, there is a tautology in the manner of relating it, unexampled in the Apostle's writings. I might urge, as a fifth reason, the opinion of all Christian antiquity, Origen only excepted. And this in a question of philology, is not without its weight."

Now we must confess, that this, Doct. Campbell, a scholar or not, seems to us to be almost as sound an argument, as that given us by the learned Doctor Brownlee.

With the text in Rev. II. 7. "To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God," and the only other passage wherein the word paradise is found, the Doctor closes his elaborate review, and in the following strikingly characteristic manner—a manner in all respects worthy of his distinguished self—†

"This, the one, only Tree of Life, is in the midst of heaven; and in the midst of the Paradise of God. Therefore, HEAVEN IS PARADISE; and PARADISE IS HEAVEN. And, hence, there is no *intermediate Place* of departed souls, except what exists in the field of fiction and romance."

*Pre. Dis. VI. Part II. Sec. 21.

†Chris. Intel. Dec. 28, 1836, No. 4.

Now all this, we suppose, must be profoundly logical,—we mean, in the opinion of Doct. Brownlee, who, with his skill in manufacturing premises, and jumping at conclusions, seldom fails, with the aid of a few capitals and italics, in proving to his own entire satisfaction whatever he pleases. But let us look, a moment, at what the Doctor considers such conclusive reasoning. He wishes to prove that Paradise is Heaven. What is his argument? Why, failing to wrest to his purpose the plain, obvious language of our Lord, and of St. Paul, he resorts to the strongly figurative language of the visions of St. John. And finding a text, Rev. XXII. 2. where the tree of life is spoken of, and where it *may* be represented as in heaven, though the word heaven is not found in the passage, he at once concludes, that Paradise, mentioned in this second chapter, must also be heaven, because it is said, there is in it the tree of life. He says, "This, one, only Tree of Life, is in the midst of heaven; and in the midst of the paradise of God. Therefore HEAVEN IS PARADISE; and PARADISE IS HEAVEN."

Let us now try the Doctor's logic on another passage. Gen. II. 9. "The tree of life also in the midst of the garden."

This, one, only Tree of Life, is in the midst of heaven; and in the midst of the garden of Eden. Therefore heaven is the garden of Eden; and the garden of Eden is heaven! O Doctor, Doctor, when wilt thou come out of the "fields of fiction and romance," learn to respect the realities of truth, and cease to quack logic? We need only add, in reference to this text, Rev. II. 7, the enlightened and reasonable remarks of that distinguished compeer, Doct. Campbell, who says,*

"Here our Lord no doubt speaks of heaven, but as he plainly alludes to the state of matters in the garden of Eden, where our first parents were placed, and where the tree of life grew, it can only be understood as a figurative expression of the promise of eternal life, forfeited by Adam, but recovered by our Lord Jesus Christ."

We have now done with the Doctor's review. And although we have noticed not a moiety of its errors, misrepresentations, and falsities, we have said enough, it is thought, to exhibit its character, and to show, that its author, as such,—for let it be remembered, we speak of Doctor B. only as an author, is not a man that can be safely trusted;—have said more, many will doubtless think, than the character of the performance, or the weight of its author, merited, and, we are free to confess, more, much more, than was intended when we began. Knowing, however, that place—not intermediate, sometimes gives to the writings of a man an importance, which their intrinsic worth could never gain for them, the cause of truth seemed to demand that this review should receive some notice. Having com-

**Pre. Dis. VI. Part II. Sec. 21.*

menced, justice to this cause required us to go on. And finding, as we advanced, the evidences of rudeness, of vanity, of shallowness, of unfairness, of misrepresentation, and of utter disregard of the truth, so rapidly multiplying upon us, that we thought it our duty to hold it up to view, with these,

“Its blushing honors thick upon it.”

We therefore resolved, not unaware of the foul treatment to which we thereby exposed ourselves, to summon to the task patience to follow the Doctor through this marvellous production, and from it, to trace an outline of the “**SMALL WHOLE LENGTH**” of this redoubtable theological combatant. This, skillfully filled up, would present, according to our fancy, a picture, that would be vastly amusing, but for the sad deformity of some of its prominent and leading features, and which, in the light we contemplate it, casts a melancholy shade over the whole figure, giving it a painful and confirmed wryness of expression. It seems unable to look in a right direction, and it expresses a sort of aversion to the plain, honest truth. It is not however in our thoughts to fill up the sketch. We can but express our deep regret at the fearful prominence of this most unfortunate blemish. It bespeaks such a determined anti-truth propensity, that it destroys all the pleasure, we otherwise might have, in anticipating the completion of the picture.

And here, a word for the Doctor. This is the one grand point, to which, if possible we would fix his attention. For, not to mention again his expositions of Scripture, or his respect for the “primitive Christian Fathers,” and to say nothing more of his regard for the Catholic Church, and especially that branch of it which is “of the good old way,” we have seen that, in a list of twelve or fifteen of the ablest and most distinguished theological writers of the last three hundred years, whom he has pretended to quote, there is not one, whom he has quoted fairly, or of whose sentiments he has given a correct account, but has, on the contrary, deliberately falsified them all. Now we know not what Doct. B. may think of this matter; but, as for ourselves, we consider such treatment of writers, whose works are not supposed to be in the hands of the great mass of the people, as a high misdemeanor—a gross outrage upon a christian community. The Doctor may himself believe as he pleases, and bring to the defence of his faith all the weight of his assertions, and the whole force of his logic, and from us he will hear no complaint. But when, to support his fancies, he goes systematically, perseveringly and publicly to work to misrepresent the sentiments of authors, and with bold effrontery, to make them say what they have not said, and deny what they have said, his conduct then becomes a matter of public concern;—and it is time that his claims to confidence should be tested, and

that the value of his testimony should be more generally known. And we repeat it, this is the great point to which it is intended to hold him. And we hope that he will not think to escape from it by any subterfuge, or in any way attempt to merge this in, or confound it with, other minor and less serious offences.

And now, one word for ourselves. If, in the course of our remarks upon the Doctor's review, we have thought it necessary occasionally to use a plainness of speech somewhat uncommon in matters of this kind, it must be borne in mind that we had to deal with a somewhat *uncommon* man; and that there has been, in justice, a demand upon us for a severity of language which we had neither inclination nor ability to meet. Let it not be supposed however that we entertain towards the Doctor any other feelings than those of good will, or that we are in any degree less his friend, because we have deemed it our duty to speak the truth plainly. Oh, no: very different from those of unkindness have been our feelings while penning these remarks. For, wide and constant as we have seen to be the Doctor's departure from the right line, and much as we have been amazed and grieved at these aberrations, we are, after all, disposed to consider them the result more of that vain glory which darkens his vision, and perverts his judgment, than any natural disposition, or settled purpose to do harm. The Doctor seems peculiarly happy in being always on the best possible terms with himself. At any rate, there has been forced on us the conviction, that here, if any where, will be found his blind side. And if with this prominent and moving characteristic constantly before us, we have not been always quite so grave as to suit the taste of some, let it be remembered that impossibilities are not required of any man; and further, that persons and actions present themselves sometimes so strangely ridiculous, that gravity itself is compelled to relax its rigid muscles, and do something even more than smile. Nor should it be forgotten that, for such indulgence, we have the sanction of higher than human authority. And as we are sure that all, who have accompanied us in our examination of this review, must be convinced that its author is not the man with whom we can at all times reason, there is seen no good reason why we should not be allowed sometimes to laugh:—

“ridentem dicere verum
Quid vetat?”



This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it
beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

3461063

JUN 21 '71 H



3 2044 105 520 118